DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 195 208	HE 013 315
AUTHOR	Moulton, Phillips P.
TITLE	Enhancing the Values of Intercollegiate Athletics at Small Colleges.
INSTITUTION	Michigan Univ., Ann Arbor. Center for the Study of Higher Education.
PUB DATE	Aug 78
NOTE	112p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Center for the Study of Higher Education, School of Education, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109 ($3.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Athletic Coaches: *Athletics: College Students: Competition: Football: Higher Education: *Intercollegiate Cooperation: *Males; Publicity: *Small Colleges: Soccer: Sportsmanship; Student Financial Aid: Student Recruitment; Success

ABSTRACT

Solutions to specific problems associated with intercollegiate athletics, primarily men's spectator sports and particularly football, are proposed in order to enhance the values of the sports programs at small colleges. After a historical summary of recurrent problems, recent proposals are noted. It is argued that most proposals for dealing with the problems of intercollegiate athletics are impractical. An attempt is made to deal realistically with the issue of winning, with means of fulfillment for coaches, and with methods of curbing the evils without sacrificing reasonable win-loss records. The following problems and evils in small colleges are considered: pressures on the coach: recruiting; subsidizing athletes: academic aid to athletes: violence, cheap shots, and exploitation: and effects on the college. The following rationalizations for a winning athletic program are addressed: morale, recruiting students, alumni support, and publicity. Practical steps toward a sound program are to formulate aims, evaluate the work of the coach, facilitate fulfillment and security for coaches, eliminate special financial aid, and reduce recruiting. The following aspects of implementing the new program are covered: role of the athletic board, maintaining a satisfactory win-loss ratio, the possibility of substituting soccer for football, and publicizing and interpreting the program. Benefits of the new program and exemplary cases here and in England are examined. A bibliography is included. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED195208

$3.00

ENHANCING THE VALUES OF INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS AT SMALL COLLEGES

by

Phillips P. Moulton

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Center for th
Study of H.E.
[illegible]
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE013 315

Center for the Study of Higher Education
School of Education
The University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109

August 1978

School of Education
Center for the Study of Higher Education

Joan S. Stark, Dean

Marvin W. Peterson, Director

Faculty

Robert T. Blackburn
Joseph P. Cosand
Zelda Gamson
Gerald Gurin
Murray Jackson
James L. Miller, Jr.
Karl Zinn

Copyright 1978 by The Regents of The University of Michigan
(Center for the Study of Higher Education)
Ann Arbor, Michigan. All rights reserved.

This Essay is Dedicated to
Presidents and Coaches of Small Colleges
in the Hope of Making their Burdens Easier to Bear
and their Vocations More Satisfying

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword vii

I. HISTORICAL SUMMARY--RECURRENT PROBLEMS--ATTEMPTS AT REFORM . . 1

II. RECENT PROPOSALS--HOPE FOR SMALL COLLEGES 9

III. PROBLEMS AND EVILS IN SMALL COLLEGES 13
    Pressures on the Coach 13
    Recruiting 15
    Subsidizing 17
    Academic Aid 19
    Violence, Cheap Shots, and Exploitation 23
    Effects on the College Community 26

IV. A SOUND APPROACH TO WINNING 31
    Justifications for Stress on Winning 31
    Identification--a Fascinating Phenomenon 32
    Are "Winning" and "Excellence" Synonymous? 34
    Competition and Cooperation 37
    A Constructive Approach to Identification and Winning . . 39

V. RATIONALIZATIONS FOR A "WINNING ATHLETIC PROGRAM" 43
    Morale 43
    Recruiting Students 47
    Alumni Support 48
    Publicity 49

VI. PRACTICAL STEPS TOWARD A SOUND PROGRAM 51
    Introduction 51
    Formulate Aims 55
    Evaluate the Work of the Coach 57
    Facilitate Fulfillment and Security for Coaches 60
    Eliminate Special Financial Aid 62
    Reduce Recruiting 63

VII. IMPLEMENTING THE NEW PROGRAM 65
    Role of the Athletic Board 65
    Maintaining a Satisfactory Win-Loss Ratio 66
    Substituting Soccer for Football? 71
    Publicizing and Interpreting the Program 80

VIII. EXEMPLARY CASES--HERE AND IN ENGLAND 83

XI. BENEFITS OF THE NEW PROGRAM 91

APPENDICES

A. ACADEMIC POTENTIAL AND ACHIEVEMENT OF ATHLETES 96

B. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ACADEMIC QUALITY AND ATHLETIC SUPREMACY 97

BIBLIOGRAPHY 99
Books and Pamphlets 99
Periodicals 101

FOR FURTHER READING 105

Foreword

The purpose of this essay is to suggest solutions to specific problems associated with intercollegiate athletics, in order that the values inherent in sport may be more fully realized. Since those values have been ably discussed by physical educators, they will be taken for granted here rather than reiterated. Although much of what follows is relevant to large universities and to athletic conferences, the focus is on individual small colleges (about 2,500 students or less). This is an area hitherto neglected, but where attention is urgently needed.

This paper is concerned primarily with men's spectator sports, particularly football, because there we find the heaviest involvement of money and the public--the two sources of most problems. This discussion is quite pertinent, however, to the burgeoning women's movement, which will become engulfed in the same network of evils unless perceptive and farsighted leadership is brought to bear on methods of avoiding them. It does not attempt to deal with the women's movement as such, or with such concerns as race relations and drug usage. These have been examined elsewhere by competent observers.

Since colleges and sport are both integral aspects of contemporary culture, this essay should interest the reflective reader who seeks to understand the current scene. It is intended primarily for those involved in higher education: administrators, trustees, alumni, coaches, athletic directors, faculty members, and students--particularly college athletes. It should be especially useful to those who serve on boards of control or on committees studying the athletic programs at their institutions. It has practical implications also for those involved in re-thinking the objectives of small colleges as they face current problems and an uncertain future. Surprising as it may be, it will become clear as we proceed that the effects of athletic policy and practice on the student population are much greater in small colleges than in large universities. In fact, the ramifications of the athletic program often have a greater effect on the total educational experience of the typical student (whether an athlete or not) than curricular innovations and teaching methods.

My interest in athletics stems originally from avid participation in many sports, in none of which I was a star, although I won my share of letters and awards. I have also enjoyed coaching and managing teams in playground and municipal competition. Having encouraged my son to engage in sports, I have been as proud as any father at the varsity letters and tophies he has garnered. During my teaching career, I have had close association with athletes and their coaches and have supported their programs.

The problems of athletics first impressed themselves upon me some twenty years ago while teaching higher education to graduate students at Union Theological Seminary and Columbia University Teachers College. At that time my students and I did some joint research regarding the effects of varsity athletics on the attainment of educational objectives. Later, as chairman of a month-long Danforth Foundation workshop I questioned the dean and three leading faculty members from each of 24 small colleges about sport-related problems at their institutions. At other summer programs sponsored by the Danforth Foundation I conducted courses for faculty members on the problems of higher education; issues regarding athletics were examined along with many others.

While chairman of the midwest Faculty Christian Fellowship for two years, involving trips to several colleges, I pursued my inquiries further. At other professional society gatherings I have seized similar opportunities, particularly at an annual meeting of the Philosophic Society for the Study of Sport, at which a session was devoted to the content of this paper. In addition, as lecturer, discussion leader, consultant, or unannounced visitor, I have questioned students, faculty members, and staff members of some fifty colleges. During the two decades covered by my investigations the problems have changed very little. They have simply grown more serious as sport has become a more pervasive aspect of our society.

This is not a sociological study replete with statistics, but it takes into account the results of scholarship in relevant areas. Unless otherwise indicated, all incidents and quotations are from small colleges. To preserve confidentiality, not all are documented here. This aims to be a balanced presentation that the reader is invited to test by personal experience or by delving into the situation at his or her own college.

Acknowledgement is due the many people who shared experiences with me, especially those who criticized an earlier draft of this paper. In addition to coaches, athletic directors, and faculty members, this included about one hundred students (mostly athletes) in my "Issues in Sport" seminars and my son Larry, who is both an athlete and a scholar.

I am grateful also to George H. Hanford of the College Entrance

Examination Board and to William N. Lovell and Robert Rue Parsonage of the higher education office of the National Council of Churches, who encouraged this project from the start and made helpful suggestions.

Staff members at the Center for the Study of Higher Education have been very supportive. Special thanks are due Robert T. Blackburn, who invited me to come to the Center and who has supplied continued guidance, to my sponsor Murray Jackson for assistance of many kinds, to Zelda F. Gamson, who read a preliminary draft of the manuscript and made many constructive suggestions, to Joanne E. MacRae, Publications Director of the Center, whose ideas and editorial expertise proved invaluable, and to Joyce Dahart, whose expert typing of the final copy made proofreading a pleasure.

Phillips P. Moulton
Visiting Scholar
Center for the Study of
  Higher Education
August, 1978

I. HISTORICAL SUMMARY--RECURRENT PROBLEMS--ATTEMPTS AT REFORM

Public interest in sport is growing tremendously. We could cite staggering figures of the millions who watch Super Bowl games and the increasing number of participants at all levels. The most impressive evidence is the skyrocketing of salaries for professional athletes. Multi-million dollar contracts and the rapidly growing number of players earning over $100,000 attest to the centrality of sport in our culture. Where money is found evils abound. Several thought-provoking accounts by star athletes reveal the corruption in professional sports, while recent articles and books cite arresting evidence of distorted values in the universities.[1]

Neither public interest in sport nor attendant evils are new. The number of participants and spectators has been mounting ever since the middle of the last century, with serious problems growing apace. As we now survey briefly the past century and a quarter, we note that the same problems keep recurring and that efforts at control and reform have had little effect. In our large universities, the situation has become increasingly worse and in some cases appears well-nigh hopeless. The outlook for constructive change in small colleges, however, is quite promising.

1852-1875

The first organized intercollegiate competition in the United States was a Yale-Harvard boat race in 1852. In succeeding years, regattas played an increasingly colorful role in the college scene. Appraising this development an historian writes: "The values and practices which accompanied its [the regatta's] growth were in most respects the precursors of all that was to follow in the rise of each intercollegiate sport."[2] Commercial interests exploited the

---

NOTE: For details regarding footnote references, see Bibliography, p. 99.

[1] See Benagh, Denlinger and Shapiro, Durso, Meggyesy, Jack Scott, and Shaw. These books are not as scholarly or constructive as many others, but they perform the important function of documenting the less favorable features of university athletic programs. Since the facts and opinions in such books are also relevant to the small college scene, they must be taken into account by policy makers at that level.

[2] Lewis, "America's First Intercollegiate Sport: The Regattas from 1852 to 1875," p. 637. This article is the source of most of the information that follows concerning regattas.

contests, as railroad officials advertised excursion trains, engaged brass bands, and invited prominent political figures to attend. The New York Herald gave the 1859 race top priority, devoting three and one-half pages to the event.

Celebrating the 1860 regatta, Harvard students surged through their hotel and into the streets, engaging the police in combat. They ripped doors and signs from stores, using them as fuel for a big bonfire. When Yale defeated Harvard in 1864, Professor Cyrus Northrop, who later became president of the University of Minnesota, led the ensuing celebration and conducted a fund-raising campaign. Alumni contributed generously, convinced that the outcome of the race was "sacredly connected with the glory of Alma Mater herself." When Yale won again the next year, the training methods and rowing style of the Harvard crew were criticized by her fans, much as University of Michigan followers criticized the preparation and strategy of coach Bo Schembechler after the Rose Bowl defeat of January, 1977.

The races of 1870 and 1873 ended in controversial decisions that were debated in public and student newspapers for months thereafter. Yale professors were accused of encouraging "winning at any cost in the belief that victorious crews had a positive effect upon enrollment."[3]

Meanwhile, additional colleges entered the races in pursuit of recognition and prestige. Then, as now, college presidents took the contests quite seriously. In 1871, President Clark of Massachusetts Agricultural College, rode through the campus shouting, "We've won! We've won!" When victory came to Cornell, President Andrew White ordered the Military Department to fire the cannons; he personally broke into the bell tower to ring the chimes. He later declared that the publicity gained by the triumph was worth more than $100,000.

In 1875-1876, Yale and Harvard withdrew from the Rowing Association of American Colleges, bringing to a close the initial phase of the development of intercollegiate athletics. The next phase was just emerging, for in 1875 the first American-type football game was played between Harvard and Yale. (The better known Rutgers-Princeton game of 1869 was English football--American soccer.)

1875-1919

In its early years, football was subject to little effectual control by administrators or faculty members. Abuses became flagrant. In 1892, President Eliot of Harvard complained of dishonesty, gambling, recruiting, and subsidizing.[4] Fisticuffs were common and the injury rate was high, especially after the "flying-wedge" was introduced. In 1904, George Meylan of Columbia University pinpointed the abuses of "excess, inordinate desire to win at any cost, the spirit of commercialism, and the tendencies to professionalism."[5] By this time football was being played across the country at hundreds of small colleges and thousands of secondary schools, as well as at large universities.

---

[3] Ibid, p. 643.

Headmasters of secondary schools became concerned because their students tended to adopt "dishonest practices employed by college players." Responding to their concern, President Theodore Roosevelt conducted a conference (on October 9, 1905) of university representatives, who pledged "to carry out in letter and spirit the rules... relating to roughness, holding, and foul play." To implement such aims, delegates from sixty-two colleges convened on December 28, 1905 and organized the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States, for which a constitution and bylaws were adopted on March 31, 1906. President Roosevelt used his influence to strengthen this organization, which in 1910 changed its name to National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA).[6]

Abuses kept cropping up, notably the practice by large universities of raiding small colleges for promising athletes. Through the leadership of the NCAA, however, a greater degree of order came to characterize intercollegiate athletics. Eligibility rules were created that greatly reduced the practice of raiding, and institutions were required to put their athletic programs under the control of the faculty. The most harmful tendencies were thus held in check until after the first World War.

1919-1930

The post-war decade has been called the Golden Age of sport, but its rapid expansion was accompanied by flagrant abuses. Typically these focused on illegal recruiting and subsidizing, resulting, for example, in the expulsion of the Universities of Iowa and Kansas from their respective conferences. Intercollegiate athletics came under strong censure from the presidents of Harvard, Columbia, Dartmouth, Chicago, and Oberlin, as well as from social critics like Bertrand Russell and William Allen White. The most basic charge was that overemphasis on sports reflected and intensified a distortion of values that caused broader intellectual and cultural concerns to be neglected. It is not surprising that the Eastern Intercollegiate Debating Association chose as its topic: "Resolved, that this house deplores the present condition of intercollegiate athletics."[7]

---

[4] Johnson, p. 181.

[5] Meylan, p. 124.

[6] Lewis, "Theodore Roosevelt's Role in the 1905 Football Controversy," pp. 720, 721, 724.

Various remedies were suggested, including the abolition of gate receipts, granting full academic status to coaches, the use of student coaches, and a greater emphasis on intramural and lifetime sports. Although such proposals were never implemented on a large scale, the ferment caused the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching to commission a survey, the conclusions of which were published in the so-called Carnegie Report in 1929.[8] This report documented the evils and stressed the need to keep sport in proper perspective and to place greater emphasis upon the true aims of education. Hopes were high that this would occur. But as a sportswriter for The Minneapolis Tribune later observed: "Then, as always, ... almost everyone in the collegiate ranks forgot about these evils in a short time."[9]

The 1950's

In the early 1950's a new wave of criticism of intercollegiate athletics followed the revelation that at least twenty-eight leading basketball players from six colleges collaborated with gamblers in "fixing" games. Such popular magazines as American and Saturday Evening Post featured articles discussing not only the basketball scandals, but also the ways in which pressures put on athletes and coaches led to abuses of many types.[10]

Responding to this outcry, the American Council on Education (ACE) appointed a committee of eleven college presidents, who formulated (early in 1952) excellent standards for the guidance of national accrediting agencies. The practical suggestions made by the presidents focused largely on peripheral matters, such as post-season games, spring practice, and fiscal responsibility. They did not specify how universities with huge stadiums and dependence on gate receipts could effect changes drastic enough to bring their athletic programs into accord with valid educational aims. The ACE recommendations were not put into practice by the accrediting agencies or by the major universities. They had little discernible long-term effect.[11]

---

[7] Betts, p. 346.

[8] Savage et al.

[9] Johnson, p. 181.

[10] Lardner, pp. 24-25, 111-113; Bee, pp. 26-27, 76-78, 80.

Beginning in 1951, committees of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools (NCA) devoted a great deal of time and effort to revising the NCA criteria for judging the intercollegiate athletic programs of member institutions. New standards were devised, which became effective September 1, 1952. Intended "to strike at the more threatening abuses of college athletics," they called for an end to the special recruiting and subsidizing of athletes.[12] This caused considerable concern among presidents of several large universities, who became alarmed when two institutions were censured on the basis of these criteria.[13]

Feeling compelled to modify its position, in 1955 the NCA replaced the 1952 standards with a new formulation. This was a rather comprehensive statement of worthy objectives. But it did not specifically disapprove of the recruiting and subsidizing of students on the basis of athletic prowess. Nor did its provisions pose a real threat to universities that failed to live up to its ideal standards. During the next four years, additional scandals surfaced in the realm of intercollegiate athletics, but the NCA did not censure any college or university.[14]

Eventually, at the NCA annual meeting in 1959, the 1955 statement was replaced by a single paragraph. This affirmed that intercollegiate

---

11. Aigler, pp. 190-191. See also Cozens and Stumpf, pp. 76-77.

12. Edmonson and Youngert, p. 186.

13. Ibid, pp. 186-187.

14. Association Notes and Editorial Comment, "A Statement of Principles on Intercollegiate Athletics," pp. 315-318. See Aigler, as well as Edmonson and Youngert, for further context for the 1955 statement.

athletics should be conducted "in a fashion consistent with the overall educational objectives on each campus," that the NCA would look to the "national and regional athletic associations" to supervise intercollegiate programs, but that the NCA reserved the right to make investigations and take appropriate action if it deemed this to be "necessary or desirable." No such action has ever been taken.[15]

One who studies the reports and memoranda of the ACE and NCA committees and individuals during the fifties must be impressed by the sincerity, diligence, and insight of very able people who spent countless hours wrestling with the problems of intercollegiate athletics. The principles formulated and suggestions made were excellent. One must also recognize, however, that the situation became no better. The evils and abuses associated with athletics continued unabated.

The Late 1960's and Early 1970's

The counter-culture movement of the 1960's eventually made an impact upon the intercollegiate athletic scene. On hundreds of campuses athletes revolted against authoritarian domination and insisted on being treated as persons rather than as cogs in a machine. This was symbolized in the Yale Alumni Magazine by two copies of the same photograph of a group of athletes. In one picture the head of each person was replaced by the Yale bulldog. The athletes all looked alike. The other picture showed their true faces -- each individual was unique.

The pressures exerted on the athletic establishment were depicted in a series of three articles in Sports Illustrated aptly entitled "The Desperate Coach" (August 25, September 1, September 8, 1969). Leadership was given the movement by Jack Scott, who founded the Institute for the Study of Sport and Society. The Institute aided Dave Meggyesy, former pro football player, in the writing of Out of Their League (1970), which documented many of the evils of intercollegiate athletics. Scott's book, The Athletic Revolution (1971), described and interpreted the campus ferment. The student protests bore fruit in gaining for many college athletes, for example, the right to determine their own hair styles and dress codes and to have a voice in the selection and retention of coaches.

---

15. Association Notes and Editorial Comment, "A Proposed Statement of Policy on Intercollegiate Athletics," pp. 276-277.

After the Vietnam war the quiet that pervaded campuses included athletes; the anticipated revolution never occurred. Criticism has persisted, however. In March 1974 the New York Times ran a series of articles documenting flagrant evils involved in recruiting and subsidizing.[16] This series and its expansion in book form (Joseph Durso, et al., The Sports Factory), presented no comprehensive solution to the problems so vividly depicted.

---

[16] Durso, Joseph, et al., "Sports Recruiting," New York Times, 10 March, pp. 1 and 52; 11 March, pp. 1 and 38; 12 March, p. 42; 13 March, p. 46; 14 March, p. 46; 15 March, p. 24; 17 March, p. 2 of Sport Section; 24 March, p. 6 of Sport Section.

II. RECENT PROPOSALS--HOPE FOR SMALL COLLEGES

In a follow-up article to the series of exposés in the New York Times, Joe Paterno, Penn State football coach, advocated four "remedies to cure the disease." First, college presidents and athletic directors should realize that their "coaches are under tremendous pressure to win," and that this is not always possible; hence they "should not be fired arbitrarily and have their tenure based on won-lost record only." Second, the NCAA should strengthen its enforcement capabilities. Third, the number of grants-in-aid allowed for each school should be reduced, so that good high school athletes will be distributed more evenly among the universities. Finally, recruiting should be regulated more stringently in order to reduce its intensity.[17]

The first proposal would scarcely be adopted at a typical big-time school, since it would entail drastic changes in outlook and program. This remedy would be realistic for many small colleges (if adequate criteria for evaluating coaches were carefully formulated) and is advocated in this essay. The other three proposals are typical of the obviously sensible palliatives that could be adopted at the big-time level if the responsible parties were willing to expend the considerable effort that would be required. Such measures, however, would not really cure the underlying disease.

In one of the more constructive analyses of recent years, J. Robert Evans, a physical educator, first reiterates the familiar story of excesses and abuses and then devotes the final twenty pages of his book to advocating specific changes on a nation-wide scale. The admirable goals and methods outlined are similar to those proposed by Joe Paterno (see above) and by the North Central Association two decades earlier. They include summit conferences, strengthening college athletic boards, and giving students more decision-making authority, as well as drastically reducing recruiting budgets, athletic scholarships, and coaching staffs, plus various minor reforms.[18]

In 1974, the American Council on Education published an excellent

---

[17] Paterno, p. 2.

[18] Evans, pp. 131-153. Essentially the same changes are advocated in Williams, pp. 10, 46.

Report by George Hanford, the purpose of which was to help the Council determine whether to launch a comprehensive study of intercollegiate athletics in the United States. In this Report, Hanford noted certain remedies that have been proposed for big-time football programs. Of chief interest is the suggestion that the universities abandon all pretense of amateurism and field professional teams, allowing the players to take courses if they wish, provided they meet admission standards. He mentions also the proposal that athletes be allowed (perhaps required) to take much reduced course loads during the playing season, gradually accumulating credits towards degrees to be completed in five or more years.[19]

In his Sports in America, James Michener combines these two approaches, advocating that the top 36 big-time universities put their teams on a fully professional basis, the players being allowed to take courses insofar as they are qualified. For the other institutions now in Division I of the NCAA, Michener suggests no radical changes, but hopes that abuses could be held in check by better rules, more rigorous enforcement, granting scholarships only for need, eliminating under-the-table payments, and requiring that athletes be kept on an academic track leading to graduation. A large order! For a third group, corresponding roughly to NCAA Division Two, he advocates eliminating athletic scholarships, reducing coaching staffs, and pruning budgets. He would have the final group, composed of all remaining schools, go further by eliminating the two-platoon system and admission charges.[20]

The proposal to field avowedly professional teams is applicable only to big-time universities and hence not directly relevant to this paper. The other suggested remedies would have little chance of being adopted by the major powers. The current situation is well expressed by investigative reporter Jim Benagh:

> The system is an intricate set of balanced trade-offs, tensions, and antagonisms among coaches, administrators, legislators, alumni, students, parents, and media people. All of them wish to

---

19. Hanford, (hereafter referred to as the Hanford Report), pp. 129-131. See also Roscoe C. Brown, "Race, Sport, and Academe," Appendix D of the Hanford Report, pp. 113-115.

20. Michener, pp. 199-205.

> share in the glory of winning the next game. But few of them care to take any responsibility beyond the winning of it.[21]

A major reason for this reluctance is that the large universities are so dominated by complex financial considerations that the athletic director of a perennial winner was probably right in observing that if one starts meddling, the whole structure may fall apart.

At a typical small college, however, the situation is quite different. Gate receipts are minimal and no major source of revenue is at stake. Nor is the school so directly dependent upon the public as a state university. The small college could adopt an educationally defensible athletic policy and program without much risk. It would require the initial agreement of only a few people: the president, the athletic director, and perhaps the coaches of spectator sports.[22] Sufficient support from the athletic board and others would follow. The contrast noted here is not between schools that have serious athletic-associated evils and those that do not; both large and small schools have them. The distinction is between schools where significant improvement can scarcely be expected and those where it may be difficult but is entirely feasible.

The crucial, strategic importance of this distinction has been growing upon me for several years. Hence I was interested in the emphasis placed upon it by Bernard P. Ireland in his thought-provoking Appendix F of the Hanford Report. He quotes at length from a perceptive article by Harry A. Scott, published in 1956 but very relevant today. Scott points out that the practices of big-time universities "have tended to set the pattern which is diligently aped--at the starvation level in most cases--by many small colleges." Contending that this need not be so, he asserts: "The smaller colleges...form the last frontier in the quest for a program of athletics that is consistent with and contributes to the goals of higher education... These colleges, therefore, are in a better position to engage in serious soul-searching and programs of self-improvement than their more powerful brethren."[23] In quoting Scott to support his "realistic approach to the proposed [ACE] study," Ireland recognizes the relatively hopeless situation in the approximately 50 major athletic programs in the country. He then advises those who conduct the study "to assume that the other 1500 or so colleges which operate significant programs of intercollegiate athletics are eagerly awaiting leadership in charting a course leading to escape from attempts to be like the 50, and to propose a plan which will attract the loyalty and cooperation of those institutions which wish to renounce the trappings of professionalism and maintain...programs which are an integral part of a balanced educational offering."[24]

---

[21] Benagh, p. xiii.

[22] In most cases, the active leadership of the president would be a distinct asset. At least, his willingness to go along with it would be well-nigh essential. Unlike the situation at major athletic powers, in few cases would his job or prestige be in jeopardy. For illuminating treatment of the role of the president, see H.A. Scott, "New Directions in Intercollegiate Athletics," pp. 33-35; idem, Competitive Sports in Schools and Colleges, pp. 116-123; Benagh, pp. 4, 68-69, 169, 171-72, 198, 201-202, 255, 259-60.

Most proposals for dealing with the problems of intercollegiate athletics are impractical. They leave too great a gap between ideal goals and means of attaining them. The present paper seeks to bridge that gap by dealing realistically with the issue of winning, with means of fulfillment for coaches, and with methods of curbing the evils without sacrificing reasonable win-loss records. A perfect solution is not to be expected, but the situation on a typical campus can be greatly improved.

---

[23] Scott, "New Directions in Intercollegiate Athletics," pp. 35-36.

[24] Ireland, p. 15. Cf. Michener, p. 217: "But the average institution...can do pretty much as it wishes, especially if it argues that by so doing, the school's financial and educational postures will be improved."

III. PROBLEMS AND EVILS IN SMALL COLLEGES

One may ask whether this discussion is really needed, since small colleges are apparently free of the problems associated with big-time athletics. At least this may seem true of the reader's own institution. "Of course this doesn't happen at small colleges" and "Nothing like that occurs here" are comments reflecting these assumptions. I suggest taking a second look. Beneath the placid surface of many a small college are the germs of evils that may not seem virulent but may become so when personnel or circumstances change. Evidence gathered from every part of the country is overwhelming that basically the evils of big-time operations--related to recruiting, subsidizing, academic integrity, exploitation of athletes, and conduct in competition--characterize, in varying degrees, small college programs. As a football guard commented after reading Gary Shaw's Meat On The Hoof, a book about the abusive methods used to produce national champions: "Many comparisons can be drawn between a big football power like the University of Texas and a small tucked-away college such as mine." Many other athletes have made similar observations. The abuses differ in degree rather than in kind. From professional sports a line of influence flows to the large universities, to small colleges, to high schools, to junior highs and even to elementary schools, as well as all the way down to such nonschool programs as Little League and Pee Wee Hockey.[25]

Before concentrating on the most important part of this essay--proposed solutions--let us look at the situation in which the coach finds himself and then examine some of the steps often taken to produce winners.

Pressures on the Coach

The coach is at the very crux of the local college situation. He bears the brunt of a great deal of criticism for the evils of athletics. My contacts with coaches convince me that this criticism is basically unjust. Insofar as the charges are true, it is not because the ethical values of coaches are worse than those of other people, but rather because of the extreme pressures to which they are subjected. The rest of us would react the same way in those circumstances. Bernie Wagner, head track coach at Oregon State University, put it this way: "I believe that if success were necessary for the academic professor, he too would control and direct the study habits and social behavior affecting success or detracting from it....It is easy to be a critic, but difficult to endure the many problems, sacrifices and hard work necessary for success."[26]

---

[25] See Edwards, pp. 314-15.

When a coach is hired he is expected to meet several criteria, one of which is that he shall have a good influence upon the personal values of his athletes. Regardless of what the college authorities say when he is hired (or fired), however, he knows that he is judged almost exclusively on whether his teams win or lose. Consider his exposed position. Not only the president and athletic director, who have a right to evaluate his work, but also students, faculty members, alumni, sportswriters, and assorted fans see the results of his every decision. They cannot be aware of the many factors behind his actions. Few of them would have the ability to handle his job or play on his teams. But this does not keep them from judging him.

After working day and night and leaving his family to go on recruiting trips, the coach may lose potential recruits because of factors beyond his control, such as a less attractive gymnasium or financial aid package than a competing school. When a team loses a game, residents of a small college town are likely to take it as a personal affront. In retaliation they excoriate or ridicule the coach. The wife of a coach I know was insulted when she went shopping and was virtually ostracized, simply because the college lost a few football games. Later her husband was fired. Then they had to find another job, move, enroll the children in a new school, and start over again in a strange location.

The coach has every conceivable incentive to win. But he receives few, if any, tangible rewards for giving priority to the true welfare of the athlete, the college, or his own moral being.

---

26. Quoted in Jack Scott, p. 48. Cf.: "They [coaches] are simply caught in the whirlpool of pressure athletics and are helpless to do anything about it until the college presidents and faculties give them some help" (Taylor, p. 179).

Under these circumstances we should not be surprised if he engages in or encourages unethical practices that seem necessary to produce victories, but that may have harmful effects on the college as a whole.

Recruiting

Without question the most important aspect of a coach's job--if he is to produce a winning team--is recruiting. Once he has the material, coaching strategy will help him win. But without the right players his other skills will be of little avail. Hence it is appropriate to review what recruiting involves and where pressures on the coach may lead to ethical or educational compromises.

Almost invariably recruiters emphasize that they seek athletes who are also good scholars. They have several reasons for this. Obviously the college stands to gain when such a "student-athlete" enrolls, and the coach will have an intelligent performer. There are two special benefits for the coach. He will not have to worry about the academic eligibility of such a player, and the recruit can be granted a scholarship on the basis of grades, thus sparing athletic grants for those of lesser scholastic attainments.

There may also be a deeper psychological reason why we frequently refer to seeking scholarly athletes. We need to persuade ourselves that academic standards will not suffer from athletic recruiting. Such persuasion is necessary when our chief aim is to enroll a particular kind of student. When asked about his recruiting objective, the coach of a small Minnesota college replied at once: "Big linemen! We're going to have bigger guys out there." The bigger guy may not meet the usual academic requirements for a college education. Rationalization will be required to justify persuading the prospect to apply and the admissions office to accept him. The more pressure the coach is under, the more pressure he will put on the prospect and the admissions staff. If the president expresses concern about the win-loss record, the admissions office will be likely to bend its standards a bit. (Incidentally, where powerhouse football teams are found, the admissions staff often includes one of the coaches.)

We tend to delight in calling attention to certain fine students among the athletes. This is obviously true and has the merit of counteracting the stereotype that all athletes are "dumb jocks." Actually, there is no reason why athletes should have greater or lesser intellectual ability than nonathletes. Like the latter, their capabilities range all the way from superb to inferior. Research studies indicate that, on the whole, athletes have approximately the same I.Q. scores as nonathletes, but have more drive for achievement, tend to be more successful in social relationships, and may generally be expected to make the most of their potential, intellectual and otherwise. That they have gone out for athletics testifies to their initiative. (See Appendix A for research relevant to this paragraph and the next one.)

The incentive to enroll prospects of lesser academic qualifications, however, is more acute when athletes are involved than it is with nonathletes. When considerable recruiting of athletes is done, the resulting recruits, on the average, are likely to have lower academic potential than nonathletes--unless special care is taken to maintain academic standards. The situation in a particular college can be ascertained by comparing the SAT (or similar) test scores of the two groups of entering freshman. Comparing the high school or college grades is less adequate, since extraneous factors may have entered in, such as favoritism to athletes or the selection of less stringent programs and courses. In any case, the statement that "certain athletes are fine students" is more a rationalization than an adequate justification for the athletic policy of a college.

The other phase of recruiting where problems may arise involves selling the college to the prospect. The abuses to which this is subject are so well known that only one aspect will be noted here--telling the prospect what financial aid to anticipate. Rather frequently freshmen athletes contend that they receive less than they were promised. This may be the fault of the students or their parents, who expect the sort of "free rides" they have heard about at large universities. But sometimes the recruiter, in his zeal to land a prospect, paints too optimistic a picture. He may fail to mention that a portion of the package under discussion is an academic scholarship, dependent upon maintaining a certain point average. Or it may depend upon the athlete making the first team. Or other conditions may be involved, of which the athlete is not fully apprised or the implications of which he does not take seriously enough.

In a case typical enough to warrant concern, a student was promised a minimum of $600, plus $300 if he made the football squad, plus $300 if he became a "starter." To play it safe, he and his father counted on $900. After arrival, he was told that none of it would be available until the second year. This meant the father had to go home and scrounge up the $900 as best he could.

Since the promises are seldom in writing, differences of opinion may arise as to what was offered. If the student complains enough and turns out to be a good player, the coach may exert pressure on the financial aids officer to stretch the resources under his control.

Another question that needs examination on a campus is whether the recruiting budget is justified in terms of value received. The difficulty in determining the budget is delineated later in this paper. In regard to the total recruiting process, enough issues have been raised here to indicate that it is not always in accord with the finest ideals of higher education.

Subsidizing

Almost as crucial in the production of winners is the task of keeping the athletes in school and eligible. This involves financial aid. In a great many small colleges athletes are given the lion's share of available funds. We are often told that football players receive aid only on the basis of two criteria: academic--maintaining a certain point average--and financial need. One might infer that since these are the bases on which aid is determined for all applicants, the athletes are on a level with nonathletes, receiving no favored treatment. But this may not be the case. Even when football players are required to meet these two standards, they are likely to be favored. The explanation is that college funds are limited: not all applicants can be given the full amount of aid to which their need entitles them. Football players usually receive more total aid per student than others. Thus a nonathlete with a point average of 3.3 and financial need of $1,500 may be given $500, while a starter on the team with a 2.5 average and $1,200 financial need receives $1,200. Another factor to consider is the ratio of grants to loans in the aid packages. Often athletes receive a higher proportion of grants than nonathletes, so that they have less to repay later.

To determine the practice on a specific campus, care must be taken to make sure that all relevant data are considered, especially if those furnishing the statistics may have a particular bias. I encountered one case where official figures provided by the school to other institutions in the athletic conference were belied by abundant testimony from the recipients of "football money." An examination of all relevant data would doubtless have revealed the source of the discrepancy, but this could not be determined by analyzing the official figures.

In some conferences colleges are allowed to make certain grants without reference to need. Here also the athlete is often favored when there is a choice between two students who have met the academic criteria. Rather frequently grants are designated for extra-curricular activity. Since some of these may be given to musicians, dramatists, debaters, etc., criticism from faculty advisers in such fields is forestalled. Generally athletes get most of these funds.

During seasons when they are not playing, athletes may be aided financially by means of paid employment on campus or in the community. Here also they are often favored. On one campus regular jobs paying about $2.50 hourly are posted for all students to see. Other jobs paying about $4.50 are saved for the coaches to allocate. For government funded work-study employment the pay is uniform, but athletes may be given first choice for the more desirable positions.

The degree to which athletes are favored varies with the college and the officials involved. Admissions, placement, and financial aid officers often have the difficult task of trying to treat all students fairly while satisfying athletic interests. For example, when a student with an athletic grant wants to quit the sport, the financial aids officer reluctantly becomes (as one writer expresses it) a "referee between an irate coach and a recalcitrant athlete," which causes him to "curse the situation that makes one class of students special."[27] Usually the pressure is all on one side. The coach is pressing for his athletes, but no one is in there pitching for the English, history, and physics majors or for maintaining the academic standing of the school.

We have described ways in which athletes are given preferential treatment--where no actual deceit or dishonesty is involved. Less common, but frequent enough to warrant concern, are dishonest methods. The most prevalent of these are fake jobs, whereby the student is paid for more hours than he actually works. Here are a few examples: One student is supposed to open and close the gym each afternoon. He generally does just that. But he is paid for the intervening hours also. Others are similar in nature: students who put out the mats for wrestling practice, repair the badminton nets, count those who use the gym, or work in the gym office. A student may work about five hours per week and get paid for fifteen. Some such jobs are financed by the college while others are under the government work-study program.

---

[27] Springer, p. 27.

In some cases off-campus establishments with which the college does business are utilized. For example, one athlete is paid for working every afternoon although he shows up only on Saturday. The money comes from a business man who feels civic pride in making a contribution to the college. More serious are cases where a coach works closely with parents in filling out the Parents Confidential Statements, exaggerating expenses and minimizing income to raise the need factor for the athlete. As for under-the-table support by alumni (whose machismo is enhanced by close association with athletes), it is hard to determine how much it occurs. It is probably rare at small colleges.

Academic Aid

Just as important as providing the athlete with financial aid is keeping him eligible to stay in school and play on the team. Much of the help rendered is praiseworthy and might well be emulated by other departments. Some coaches conduct required study sessions--perhaps from 7:00 to 9:00 p.m. week nights. Some regularly check their athletes' standing in each course to see whether they are doing well or need help. Some arrange tutoring sessions for certain courses, such as freshman English or natural science. The coaches are really interested in the progress (and eligibility) of their charges and stand ready to aid them. The student is helped and no one is harmed. If all departments would be similarly solicitous for the welfare of their students, a smaller percentage would flunk out.

Other methods of keeping athletes eligible are less commendable. Athletes are often steered into courses where the grading is highest or the work easiest. Sometimes this is done informally. Or a "tracer" may be used: a good student is sent through a course in order to assess its suitability for the others. The disadvantage for the athlete is that he may remain eligible for a year or so but flunk out later when he takes harder required courses that were by-passed earlier. Or he may manage to graduate but lack courses needed to prepare him adequately for graduate school or his vocation.

In the past, the number of easy courses was held in check by the desire of professors to maintain the reputation of being rigorous scholars. When the proportion of athletes became embarrassingly large a professor would tend to stiffen the course requirements. In recent years, however, a new, ominous trend is occurring. Declining enrollments and budgets are putting professors on the spot (especially in small, private colleges). One without enough students may lose his job. Therefore he will be strongly tempted to compromise his academic integrity in order to maintain an acceptable student load. This puts the various departments and professors in competition with each other. Hence the strategy of the professor may become just the opposite of what it was ten years ago. While he would like to retain his reputation as a scholar, he is even more anxious to retain his job. Instead of making his courses hard to keep out the floaters, he makes them easy in order to attract anyone who will take them. With an increasing percentage of students being recruited by the athletic department, the professor has a natural group to which to appeal. He waters down his course, gives the athletes a few breaks, and gets on their preferred list.

After the athlete has made out his schedule of courses, he faces the problem of passing them. An important function of the coach is what may be called public relations with faculty members. He may invite them to meet the prospects and their parents in the spring, eat at the training table after they arrive, or (in special cases) sit on the bench or in the box with assistant coaches. Such invitations impress me as being legitimate so long as they do not lead to the expectation that athletes will be favored. When an athlete has academic difficulties, the line may be thin between legitimate aid and privileged treatment. Simply making the professors aware of the athletes in their classes may result in consciously or unconsciously giving them breaks in borderline cases.

On a campus of 1200 students, the athletic tutor assured a professor that a certain athlete was a sincere worker with real interest in the course, who needed a little extra attention in order to improve. The tutor confided to me that the athlete was goofing off academically, trusting to luck (or the persuasive powers of the "tutor"). In more serious cases, arrangements are made for a student to drop a course without penalty. If this leaves him short of the hours required for eligibility, a course is added. Maneuvers of this sort may encounter difficulties in terms of deadlines for dropping and adding. An independent study or physical education course may be easier to arrange than others, or a special petition may be possible. After all, it is argued, the college should be flexible enough to meet the needs of the individual student.

We have been discussing what may be done before the final grade is issued. The real problem comes when the student receives an "F" that makes him ineligible. So long as no pressure is applied, a student can scarcely be blamed for asking a professor whether he can do extra work to raise his grade. The coach, more aware of the educational implications, is usually reluctant to try to get a grade changed. It is embarrassing and is likely to involve a hassle with the registrar. In any case the professor is in control of the situation; if a grade is changed, he must share a major portion of the blame.

Some professors gain a reputation for being accommodating; others refuse to compromise. In one case a grade was changed at the start of the summer with the understanding that the student would submit a paper in the fall--quite a risky procedure. Elsewhere the head of the physical education department had the courage to give a basketball player what he deserved at the end of the first semester--an "F". The player was a star, whose absence would greatly handicap the team the second semester. Under considerable pressure, the department head finally allowed the athlete to do additional study and take the examination over. The athlete was too lazy to apply himself and did no better the second time. The professor stood his ground, but was viewed by the coaches as a traitor and was vilified by the fans in the community, with which the college had very close ties.

At another college a part-time instructor agreed to change a grade, but the registrar, a bit weary of such requests, refused. The word spread among athletes that grade changing was no longer possible. According to my informant, some of them took a more serious attitude towards their studies and they had increased respect for the registrar.

One may rationalize that if an athlete is willing to do extra work, a change is legitimate. But the athlete should be given no privilege which is not extended to the entire class. Grades are important to all of them, and some may have lost scholarships or other benefits because of the grades they received. If the athlete is allowed to take the final exam over or write an extra paper, every student in that class should be notified and given the same opportunity.

In addition to the ways players are kept eligible are methods used by the players themselves. One of these is cheating to pass courses. To be sure, athletes are not the only ones who cheat. But there are special reasons why cheating is likely to increase considerably when a college decides to "improve its athletic program" by taking the steps necessary to win more games. As we have noted, recruiting athletes almost invariably results in the enrollment of some who are not really interested in a liberal arts education, as well as some who lack the intellectual capacity to succeed academically. Such students are more likely to cheat than others.

More significant are the rationalizations by which an athlete may justify cheating. When he has been specially recruited, subsidized, and favored in other ways, the implication is that he is conferring a benefit upon the college by attending school and helping to win games. Because of the hours demanded by his sport, he has less time than the nonathlete to prepare for his courses. He may have seen someone else engage in or condone questionable practices in order to win. He thus comes to feel that his contribution to the college is important enough to justify the cheating. For other students to help an athlete may be viewed as loyal support of the school. At a small college in Iowa, for example, a group of football players gathered around a girl and persuaded her to do her bit by passing them the necessary answers during the test the next day. It is not easy to resist that sort of pressure.

Another feature of the cheating done by athletes tends to give it legitimacy. The nonathlete cheater acts only for his personal self-interest. But the athletes work as a group for a common goal that is deemed more important than a single individual. Bound by common ties, they sit together during an exam and share their papers with each other. Or a good student-athlete will take an exam or write a paper for a poor one.

In one fascinating case a professor was teaching a large class required of all sophomores. While grading an exam dealing with educational theories, he came upon a paper which was fairly good but which was perplexing in that every now and then the word "journalism" appeared where it made no sense. It had no connection with the preceding or following words. Later he came to a paper very similar to the first, but with no reference to journalism. Comparing the two, he unravelled the mystery. The first student had obviously sat beside the second and copied from his exam. But whenever he saw the word "formalism" (a type of educational theory), he mistook it for "journalism," which appears very similar. He knew so little about the course that the word "formalism" was unfamiliar to him, and he was not intellectually sharp enough to realize that "journalism" was sheer nonsense in that context. Upon talking with the better of the two students the professor was given this explanation: Both students were on the football squad. The student who copied was the first string fullback, a pleasant fellow but unable to comprehend his courses. The good student was not a starter but wanted to do his bit for his friend, the team, and the school. His contribution was to help the fullback remain eligible in whatever way he could.

Still another factor tends to produce a higher incidence of cheating among athletes. When a nonathlete fails a course, it seldom has an immediate or drastic effect. Few people know about it and he can make up for it in time to graduate. But when a basketball player fails a final exam on January 30, he is omitted from the line-up on February 10. The fans all know about it and he feels that he has let down the coach, the team, and the college. He is tempted to use any available means to make sure this does not happen.

I assume that athletes are no better or worse than nonathletes. But the special factors just noted make some of them more likely to cheat. In a small college this affects the rest of the student body tending to increase the total amount of cheating. The important point is that these special factors result from the attempt by the college to recruit and retain superior athletes as a means of attaining an "excellent" athletic program.

Violence, Cheap Shots, and Exploitation

Up to this point I have dealt with evils related to recruiting, subsidizing, and maintaining eligibility. Equally serious are methods sometimes used on the football field or basketball court. The actions of a coach are most visible at basketball games, where spectators are closer to the action. When an angry coach berates the officials or throws a chair out on the court, it is not surprising that the players later start fighting. The coach may be the real cause of a fight through his prior attitude and actions, even though he appears as peacemaker when it reaches its peak. In those cases where he did not incite the riot, he could generally have prevented it by the proper attitude and instruction before the game. Rarely will players "clear the bench" if the coach has emphasized that he will not tolerate such conduct.

Beating and swearing at football players seem more common at the high school level than in college, perhaps because younger players are easier to intimidate. But it occurs among college coaches. The latter may also vent their ire at the equipment. Two different cases have come to my attention where coaches in small colleges ripped apart the microphone and ear-phones they were wearing at a game. On one campus when the editor of the student paper reported the destruction of equipment and the striking of a player by the coach, the college president and athletic director reprimanded the editor (not the coach). One coach I know deliberately incurs the hatred of the players, hoping that since it cannot be expressed openly at him, it will be vented upon the opposing team, with beneficial results on the scoreboard.

When others press the coach to produce a better win-loss record, he may not be the chief one to blame for his actions. At one church college the president fired the head football coach, partly because the "language he directed at the players was not appropriate for a Christian institution." Yet the anxiety that heightened the volatility of the coach was induced by the fear of losing his job if he failed to win.

Another result of the pressures we put on the coach is dirty playing, especially on the football field. Coaches generally oppose such actions as clipping, which result in long penalties. But a good deal of dirty playing takes place beyond the eyes of officials: jumping on a leg, twisting an ankle, jabbing with an elbow, spearing with the head, and cheap shots after the whistle blows. Such methods may pay off--by reducing a player's hitting power, by intimidating him so that he will avoid a certain play or opponent, or by knocking him out of the game altogether. Some teams are known for this kind of playing. Usually it can be traced back to the attitude of the coach. Even his language may foment it: "Kill him," "Punish him," "Hit him so he won't want to get up." Most coaches make it clear that they do not want to win by foul methods; some ignore the issue; some give the impression that anything is OK--except getting caught. Knowing what is going on without saying anything conveys this message to the players.

Occasionally a coach deliberately orders or encourages dirty playing. A head coach at a church college of 800 students told certain players that their main job was to see that the opponent who returned kickoffs would not survive into the second half. Elsewhere a defensive coach collected a kitty of $20 to pay the one who knocked the opposing quarterback out of the game. They got him out in the third quarter and won 12-10. Players at another campus were paid specified amounts not only for such achievements as interceptions, but also for hitting a player so hard that he had to be removed. If two players combined to do the job, each received the reward. One of them reported, "The extra cash comes in handy on a date after the game."

A borderline situation for the coach, where the pressure to win may cause him to exploit the players, concerns the use of injured athletes. Four people may be involved in the decision as to whether or not to use a player: the athlete, the trainer, the coach, and the team doctor. The athlete usually wants to play; but sometimes the coach exerts extra pressure by implying that his manhood is involved. The coach really ought to be a restraining influence, since he is more aware of possible harmful effects. The trainer is considered subordinate to the coach, subject to the latter's influence. The doctor is the final authority, but naturally wants to be cooperative. A coach may influence him by phoning frequently during the week to express concern as to whether the player will be ready by Saturday. A great deal depends, of course, upon the personalities of the individuals involved. During a game, the decision as to whether a player takes part is often left to the coach. A player who is just getting over the flu, for example, may sit on the bench--and then be put in if the score is close.

The use of novocaine or "freezing" to deaden the pain of an injury is the most common form of abuse. This enables the player to continue in the game but may also cause him to exacerbate the injury without knowing it. In some cases an extra shot of cortisone is given the day before the contest. This not only kills the pain but promotes healing; its therapeutic effect, however, may be more than offset by the abuse the injury receives. Sometimes a coach will have a cast removed for the game; the limb is taped up for the contest and the cast is restored afterwards. One player submitted to this treatment each weekend for an entire season. On occasion, also, a player foregoes an operation until the season is over, taking a chance on a less thorough recovery. Second string players are given less attention. They do not receive as much treatment, but they are less likely to be pushed into the game before their injuries have completely healed.

Some coaches belittle injuries and assume they are not serious unless a broken bone protrudes through the flesh. "Don't worry about them little hurts" and "You can't make the club in the tub" are two of the favorite phrases of their mentors reported to me by players. A center whose left hand was broken was told that night: "Just be sure you are ready for the game next Saturday." He was. He played in every game--and still has a lump on that hand. At another school an offensive lineman injured a foot. The trainer said it was broken and began attending to it. The coach put in a substitute. But the team was in a touchdown drive and the replacement missed his block on the next play. The coach hollered, "The foot isn't broken," ordered the trainer to tape it up, and sent the player back in. The x-ray later revealed a double fracture. The team won that game and eventually the championship of its obscure league. The injured player didn't miss a game. Now, a couple of years later, the foot still pains him.

Other cases could be cited--of the lineman who played through a whole season with two broken wrists, of another with a broken arm, of the doctor who administered ten aspirin tablets to deaden pain. Since few of us earn a living by manual labor, it really isn't so bad that a joint or so bothers one through life because it was not allowed to heal rightly. But incidents like this show that the evils associated with athletics are not confined to big-time schools.

It all comes down to the fact that players are sometimes used to promote the interests of their elders. This is to be expected when the coach knows that his job depends on the win-loss ratio. A professor at a college of less than 1,000 students compares the practice there to the actions of "French generals in World War I who sent wave after wave of soldiers on hopeless charges in order to distinguish themselves as commanders." Athletes are given scholarships and other privileges, but this is often offset by the exploitation they suffer.

Effects on the College Community

Beyond the exploitation of students the practices we have been discussing affect the college community in four major interrelated respects: educational, ethical, emotional, and economic. The effort spent recruiting and arranging subsidies affects the total educational program insofar as it influences, for example, admissions policies and the distribution of scholarships. It diverts the attention of the athletic staff from the true values of physical education for all students. Moreover, students are not stimulated intellectually by Mickey Mouse courses into which athletes are steered and which attract others as well. And when students have come to a certain college primarily for athletic reasons, they are more likely to become involved in practices like cheating and rowdyism, which are not conducive to the best educational climate.[28] The impact of an easily

---

28. The reason is primarily that since they are not so interested in studies they need to cheat in order to pass and they get involved in rowdyism as a diversion from boredom. This is true also of nonathletes who lack interest in academic work. But there may be a special reason why the bored athlete seeks relief in rowdyism. The people who enjoy contact sports are more likely than nonathletes to express themselves physically. The Harvard Psychiatric Service reports that athletes who have problems are reluctant to seek its help, probably because "for many athletes physical activity, rather than talking things out, appears to offer a means of expressing feelings and aggressions" (Michener, p. 242). This may explain Woody Hayes' penchant for destroying side-line markers or his watch or cap. This is probably healthier than repressing his feelings and is consonant with his honest, open personality.

identifiable group of athletes upon communal life at a small college is more pervasive than at a large university, where they comprise a smaller proportion of the population and tend to be more isolated. This is most obvious where almost all of the students are white except for a specially imported group of black athletes, or where the recruits are Roman Catholic at a Protestant college, or Canadian, or have other distinguishing features.

College personnel are doubtless sincere in asserting that small colleges foster sound ethical values. But the pressure to win often leads to engaging in or condoning practices that do just the opposite. A student at a midwest college cited disgust at such practices as his reason for not going out for the swim team. Athletes and other observant students are not challenged to develop as ethical individuals by such examples as that of coach Ned Harkness, formerly of Union College, who was guilty of a recruiting violation and then lied about it to the college president "to save my hockey program."[29]

The athlete is even likely to suffer emotionally. Intense preoccupation with winning--not only during the contest, but before and after--is scarcely conducive to a sound mind in a sound body. Certainly the person who realizes that victory is not the most important thing is better able to serve constructively in the real world than one who is programmed to lord it over others when his team wins and to wallow in the slough of despond when it loses.

The college education of the athlete begins when he is recruited. After he arrives on campus, it continues not only in the classroom, but in the total atmosphere in which he lives. How he is subsidized, made eligible, counseled, coached, treated on the field and off--all contribute to the learning process and affect his sense of values.

Turning now to the economic picture, we find that the cost of intercollegiate athletics at a small college is rarely visible. In fact, as one college president confides, it may not be known--even to the administrative officers. When an official recruiting budget is available, for example, it is likely to picture only a fraction of the whole. The reason is that many items are absorbed in other

---

29. Regarding the Union College situation, see articles by Steve Smith. Cf. this quotation from a speech made by former President F.L. Hovde of Purdue University at a joint meeting of the NCAA and the American Football Coaches Association: "How can any ... college teach honesty, integrity, ... good sportsmanship ... if those in responsibility don't practice what they preach?" (Edmonson, p. 177).

sections of the total college budget. This may be the case with printing and mailing expenses, the use of college-owned automobiles, other travel expenses, long distance calls, and accommodations for high school seniors who visit the campus. The proportion of staff time is often understated, especially when it involves not only the coaches, their assistants, and secretaries, but also major portions of the workload of admissions officers.

When to recruiting one adds equipment, uniforms, travel expenses for forty-eight players, and the time spent on coaching, the cost of fielding teams in football and basketball can run well over six figures not counting the largest item of all--financial aid. If the total amount were seen for what it is, it would dwarf such budgetary items as minor sports, intramural programs, the various academic departments, and library books. These items are directly affected, since expenditures for intercollegiate athletics come primarily from the general budget (gate receipts being minimal in small colleges).

Small colleges do not spend excessive amounts on intramurals or lifetime sports. Burdensome budgets are found only with the spectator sports. Because of the smaller squad size and lower equipment costs, basketball costs a great deal less than football. The most significant point to investigate then, is the proportion of the total athletic budget spent on football.

Despite the difficulty of getting reliable data and the different accounting methods among colleges, the data I have gathered show quite clearly the imbalance at this point. At three typical colleges, the proportion of the total athletic budget spent on football runs about as follows: At College A (enrollment: 800), it is about 33 percent of the total, including intramurals, but not salaries or athletic scholarships. About half of the athletic scholarships are for football. At College B (enrollment: 1300), it is about 32 percent of the total budget of $80,000 for 16 intercollegiate sports (not counting salaries or scholarships). At College C (enrollment: 1600), football costs about 31 percent of the total for intercollegiate sports, plus the "lion's share" of the general athletic expenses not allocated to specific sports.[30]

---

[30] These percentages accord with those of an NCAA study indicating that from 1960 to 1969 small college football costs ranged from 26 percent to 33 percent of the total intercollegiate athletic budget, not counting overhead expenses. See Raiborn, pp. 2, 45, 48.

Most of the colleges whose athletic expenses I have checked estimate that a little over 50 percent of general (non-allocated) expenses and staff time, and a somewhat higher proportion of athletic scholarships, are for football. With increasing specialization, it is becoming rather common for small colleges to employ five or more football coaches. (One college with 500 men enrolled has nine.) Usually only one devotes practically full-time for eleven months to football, perhaps also coaching a spring sport and teaching a course on "Football Strategy." The others generally coach other sports, teach a few courses, or are employed on the admissions staff or elsewhere on campus. Others may be high school coaches (part-time at the college). Most of them may have recruiting duties and a couple may do scouting. Although part-time coaches are seldom paid very much, the total football budget is no minor item.

In considering the effects of "improving the athletic program" one needs to confront the ironic fact that the total price that is paid often fails to accomplish its goal--producing winners. The teams may lose. After all, the number of losers always equals the number of winners. The win-loss record depends partly on many factors that the college cannot control, such as similar escalation by its opponents, injuries of key players, or the wind that blows a place kick two inches off course.

Consider how often a coach and team are baffled as they try to figure out why they lost, perhaps after a winning first half. On the other hand one sometimes finds that a team of true amateurs emerges as a consistent winner. Several years ago when Carleton College won the championship of its conference, some professors there were concerned as to whether the high academic standards of the college were being impaired. This would generally be a real possibility. But an investigation to discover what price was paid for victory revealed that the athletes were not given preferential treatment of any kind. One cannot be sure that awarding athletic grants will produce a winner or that failure to do so will produce a loser. This is worth pondering by the department chairman who notes huge sums spent on a football program while he must release a good professor because of insufficient funds.[31]

---

31. Even the expenditure of huge sums by the larger schools often fails to pay off in the victory column. For details of several cases, see Evans, pp. 115-116, and Benagh, pp. x, 31-73, 115-122, 284 (Hardin-Simmons item).

The evils we have been discussing are generally worse at colleges of lower quality (See Appendix B). Various reasons may be suggested. One is that members of the faculty and administration at the better colleges are more committed to the intellectual life and the true values of a liberal arts education. Hence they are less willing to compromise those values. The chief reason is that the quality school, having genuine academic virtues to extol, may feel less need to use athletics as a means of gaining publicity, attracting students, and maintaining the loyalty of alumni. This distinction between higher and lower quality schools does not always apply, however, for even at the most prestigious centers of learning one may find administrators and faculty members who are unduly concerned about their athletic image. Some years ago, watching a basketball game at such an institution, I was fascinated by a spectator who was vociferous in criticizing the officials and members of the opposing team. He was so rabid and took each play or decision so seriously that I enquired who he was--to learn that he was the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts!

IV. A SOUND APPROACH TO WINNING

Justifications for Stress on Winning

Any consideration of the problems related to athletics must confront the question of winning. Nearly all of the evils involved in recruiting, subsidizing, dirty playing, etc., come from the desire to win. Yet that is a legitimate desire, and it would be impossible to eliminate it even if we wished to do so. Our task, rather, is to accept winning as a goal and ask how it relates to other possible goals. Should it be "the only thing," the most important thing, or one among several objectives, some of which we may rank above it?[32] Temporarily ignoring the beneficial effects on public relations and finance, let us examine the major arguments for stress on winning, consider the extent of their validity, and then offer definite suggestions for an adequate policy regarding the issue.

The most frequently cited reason for beefing up a program to produce winners was well stated by an alumni group: "Let's do it right if we're going to do it at all. We strive for excellence in everything we do." This idea has been echoed by scores of college presidents, athletic directors, and coaches. A faculty member once used this analogy: "If you need an operation, you would scarcely choose a surgeon who doesn't really care whether he wins or loses." Certainly one cannot deny the validity of the pursuit of excellence.

Another argument for stress on winning is that competition is integral to human progress; the survival of the fittest in the evolutionary process involves competition at every level. Moreover, the value of success is axiomatic in human society, at least in the United States. Since winning is the goal of competition, to emphasize it is to prepare students for the world in which they live. Not to give it high priority is seen as futile--as going counter to human nature. Particularly, as sport psychologists Bruce C. Ogilvie

---

32. Lombardi's famous words--"Winning is not everything, it is the only thing"--have been quoted hundreds of times. Yet hitherto no one has observed that literally they make no sense. "Winning is the only thing" means exactly the same as "winning is everything." Thus his statement is the same as saying "Winning is not everything, it is everything"--obviously contradictory.

and Thomas A. Tutko observe, it is to "deny the coach's life's work, and his very existence."[33]

Identification--a Fascinating Phenomenon

Approaching the issue from a different perspective, we may ask: Why do so many of us become emotionally involved in the fortunes of whatever team happens to be related to the community of which we are members? One of the most intriguing phenomena in the fascinating world of sport is this identification of a person or community with a team. In 1973 the following item appeared in a small town paper in Michigan:

> In Britton they still like to talk about March 23, 1963, and March 21, 1964, undoubtedly the greatest days ever in the history of Britton. On those two days the local high school basketball team, the Britton Tories, won the class D state championship--the only team in Lenawee County to perform the feat.[34]

It is a far cry from a class D high school team to the Olympic Games. Yet Richard G. Mandell, a historian who has made a special study of the Olympics, writes that each national committee tends to assume that it must win in order to prove the superiority of its political system and way of life.[35] The relevance of this to our present discussion becomes clear as we read the observation of a leading American editor:

> An alumnus may achieve no distinction whatever, either in his calling or as a man of culture in his community. But if he can only crow over the other members of his golf foursome or win his $5 bet with the alumnus of a rival college, he feels that in some mysterious fashion he has acquired loftier stature in the

---

[33] Ogilvie and Tutko, p. 63.

[34] Steve Phenicie, p. 2.

[35] G. Stuttaford, pp. 36-37.

> eyes of his fellow citizens. Silly? Of course. It's downright infantile.[36]

Such identification of the whole institution and its members with the team helps explain the pressure alumni sometimes put on college administrators and coaches to produce winners.

Why we so identify ourselves is not readily apparent. In the fall of 1974 I relayed to my wife, whose interest in football is less avid than mine, the remark of a radio commentator that all Detroiters should be deeply grateful to the Detroit Lions for defeating the Minnesota Vikings. She asked in bewilderment, "Why?" A partial explanation of this type of attachment was offered by star relief pitcher Mike Marshall when he was with the Montreal Expos. He caused quite a stir by saying of the Expo fans that their excitement when the team won and their depression when it lost revealed a void in their lives.[37]

At several points in The Joy of Sports, the philosopher Michael Novak casts sidelights on the phenomenon of identification. Most intriguing is his comment on the religious aspect:

> Once the athlete accepts the uniform, he is in effect donning priestly vestments. It is the function of priests to offer sacrifices. As at the Christian Mass, in athletics the priest is also the victim: he who offers and

---

36. "Touchdowns at Any Price," pp. 136-137. An intriguing case history of a man who identified with the Philadelphia Athletics over a lifetime is presented in Michener (pp. 18-26). At age seventy the man, reminiscing quietly in his room, recalled a crucial error made in the World Series forty-one years before and was heard to mutter: "By God, I'd like to strangle Jimmy Moore!" See also pp. 100, 382, and 427 for accounts of the effects of identification, including the loss of an election in Britain and suicides in Japan.

37. "Marshall Seeks Professorship--After Baseball," p. 12. Cf. the statement made (in a letter to the author) by Richard Birdsall, professor of history at Connecticut College, that people feel the need for "the glory of victory to compensate for inner emptiness," and that this "compulsive desire to win" helps explain the "great attraction of war."

> he who is offered are one and the same. Often the sacrifice is literal: smashed knees, torn muscles... Always the sacrifice is ritual: the athlete bears the burden of identification. He is no longer living his own life only. Others are living in him... They berate him, they glory in him. He has given up his private persona and assumed a liturgical persona... He is now a representative of others. His actions are vicariously theirs. His sufferings and his triumphs,... his good fortune and his ill fortune all become theirs. If the fates favor him, they also favor _them_. His deeds become messages from beyond, revelations of the favor of the gods. Only by some such an interpretation can we explain the dynamics of the psychic bond between an athlete and the fans.[38]

Are "Winning" and "Excellence" Synonyms?

Identification, competition, and the pursuit of excellence (or success) account for the stress on winning. In this context, let us examine the relation of winning to the major goals of higher education in general and of physical education in particular. As already noted, we tend to justify emphasis on winning by referring to "excellence" as a proper goal of the entire institution, including its intercollegiate sports.

A very perceptive observation concerning this type of justification was made by former president John Sawyer of Williams College at a meeting of presidents and athletic directors of the New England Small College Athletic Conference. He recognized that "the pursuit of excellence theme has its natural appeal." He declared, however, that it can "cast a shadow" over a sound athletic policy, although the danger is "difficult to recognize and deal with" because the theme "can be so easily self-deceptive." He pointed out that it tends to result in focusing staff and resources "on a small number of athletes" and reducing "the range of offerings in which significant numbers would participate," and so "endangers support of the whole. For when the final budget crunch comes, the whole athletic program can only be defended at these kinds of colleges on the basis of very wide student participation and the contribution it makes to their personal growth."[39]

---

[38] P. 133. See also pp. x, 31-32, 143-44, 179-80, 182, 235, 264, 268, 303, and 306.

The "excellence" rationalization would have some merit if the varsity teams were an integral part of the physical education and intramural programs--if they were the capstone to which students progressed by gaining proficiency at the lower levels. But this is not the case; the only relationship between the varsity programs and those available to all students is often a negative one.

The issue is clarified if we ask just what we mean by "excellent" and to what it applies.[40] A winning record means that the coaches have succeeded in recruiting and retaining athletes who are able to put points on the scoreboard. The coaches managed to land a six-foot-ten basketball star or a "big, strong tailback who can carry the ball thirty-five times a game." In this sense, the coaches have done an excellent recruiting job. Even cursory reflection, however, reveals that this does not imply excellence in achieving the basic aims of the college--or even of the physical education or athletic endeavors. As James Macholtz, Chairman of the Department of Physical Education at Anderson College, has written: "An athletic program should distinguish between win-loss records and quality of program."[41]

---

39. Minutes of the meeting of the Conference Athletic Directors and Presidents' Executive Committee, 24-25 May, 1971.

40. Cf. James W. Keating, a professor of philosophy who has devoted considerable thought to issues regarding athletics: "Excellence can be pursued in myriad endeavors and its pursuit in one activity may directly conflict with its pursuit in another. To the exhortation, 'pursue excellence,' a most appropriate response is--in what?" (p. 428). One of the few attempts to clarify the meaning of excellence for a college program is the statement by Warren Fraleigh referred to in note 60.

41. "Statement of Principles to Guide in the Development of Goals and Policies for a Program of Athletics," unpublished eleven page document, p. 4. Cf. this statement by a student-athlete: "Any school willing to risk NCAA probation can probably buy themselves an excellent team. But this does not mean the school has a good athletic program--only that they have won a lot of games."

In his well-researched volume Lords of the Locker Room, Martin Ralbovsky quotes a retired high school coach who claims that inhumane coaching methods result from school administrators' desire for "a successful sports program." The coach continued:

> The trouble is, school administrators do not think deeply enough to decide what is meant by being successful. Is the successful sports program one in which the team goes undefeated and the kids are being turned into little robots, hating every minute of it? Or is being successful having a so-so season during which the kids...enjoy themselves and expand themselves a little bit as individuals?[42]

Writing on the proper aims of physical education and athletics, Marlin MacKenzie of Columbia University refers to such developmental goals as self-direction, responsibility, struggling to overcome weakness, and not being afraid to fail. The sport psychologists Thomas A. Tutko and Jack W. Richards redefine winning to mean that "each athlete reach his maximum potential."[43] The point made by these different writers is that winning, in the usual sense of the term, is not an adequate criterion by which to evaluate a program.

Suppose a league had ten teams, with coaches who were approximately equal in every respect, all of whom were very effective in enabling each player to reach his potential and to attain the qualities listed by MacKenzie. From every reasonable viewpoint we would say that each coach did an excellent job. But judged by the win-loss column, only two or three could be considered excellent, while those ranked from 6 to 10 would be viewed as failures. Such insights help us realize that "doing it right"--a truly excellent program--need not mean gaining victories; it might better refer, as a student critic of that statement expressed it, "to ethical and educational values." Clearly the plea of "excellence" to justify insistence on fielding winners cannot stand impartial scrutiny.

---

[42] P. 120.

[43] MacKenzie, p. 114. Tutko and Richards, p. vii.

Competition and Cooperation

What about the argument that exalts winning as the goal of competition--an essential aspect of our society? Without question competition often stimulates achievement. As tennis players know, the quality of one's game depends largely on the quality of the other player. "Competition," says Lou Brock, the sensational baserunner, "is what keeps me playing--the psychological warfare of matching skill against skill, and wit against wit."[44] When it harms no one else, competition has merit.

But often it means winning at the expense of moral principles or the "wringing of success from somebody's failure."[45] Marlin MacKenzie rightly asks: "Is outdoing one's fellow man actually a victory in life?"[46] After many years as a sport psychologist, Bruce C. Ogilvie shocked a conference of coaches and athletic directors by declaring flatly that competition and love are irreconcilable. Love aims at the welfare of all. Competition is too often divisive and breeds hostility. Any given contest has only one winner--who may face a tougher opponent in the next match. The more he wins, the more anxious he becomes lest victory be snatched away. Sooner or later it is. Simple mathematics warns that if we think in terms of winners and losers, most of us will be losers most of the time. We need to readjust our thinking so that each glories in the worth and achievement of others as well as one's self.[47]

But what about the idea, expressed a few years ago in books by Robert Ardrey and Konrad Lorenz that people are predominantly aggressive and competitive animals because of innate, instinctive tendencies?[48] The answer is that the methods and conclusions of these authors have been sharply challenged, notably by fourteen scholars who collaborated for this purpose in Man and Aggression, edited by Ashley Montagu (1968). In this volume and in numerous research studies, we read that to a great extent pre-human primates were basically amiable and unaggressive and that some human societies give high priority to gentleness, peace, and cooperative activities. Richard Leakey, anthropologist, and Roger Lewin, biochemist and editor of the British journal New Scientist, in their book Origins (1977) contend that humans have the capacity for both violent competition and friendly cooperation. These are cultural attributes, they assert, acquired during socialization. We can choose which way to go.[49]

---

[44] Eldridge, p. 5.

[45] Henry, p. 83.

[46] MacKenzie, p. 114.

[47] Cf. Keating, describing a society in which everyone tried to be a winner: "It would be a society in which frustration, disappointment and defeat would be constant companions of the vast majority of its citizens" (p. 431).

[48] Ardrey and Lorenz in bibliography.

Along what lines may we develop a sound philosophy and practice regarding competition? First, we may gain the zest and stimulus competition affords through friendly rivalry--enjoying the fun without the anxiety. Further, instead of focusing on defeating the opponent, we may shift our attention to competing with ourselves and with our situation: we may accept the challenge of surpassing our own previous achievements and overcoming the obstacles life inevitably presents. We need to realize that if we do our best in honorable fashion, we may rightly gain a sense of achievement and fulfillment. One of my students has suggested that perhaps "competition in ethical living" would be a viable alternative to the ordinary scramble for position. I believe she did not have literal competition in mind, but the exercise of creative imagination in conducting athletic programs according to ethical principles and fostering a sense of satisfaction on the part of coaches and fans when ethics takes precedence over expediency.

We may also avail ourselves of the experience of other nations, in several of which we find games that are cooperative rather than competitive. It is encouraging that in the United States creative groups are developing games of this nature. In sport, and in other areas of life, it is time to stress competition less and cooperation more.[50]

---

[49] As early as 1902, Peter Kropotkin published his pioneer work on symbiosis, Mutual Aid: A Factor in Evolution, devoted largely to correcting Darwin's one-sided emphasis on the predatory aspects of life. In the 1950's Pitirim Sorokin of the Harvard Research Center in Creative Altruism, in The Ways and Power of Love and other volumes, stressed the significance of love and cooperation in the evolution of humankind. Recently three more books have appeared that take an optimistic view of human nature: Caring, by Willard Gaylin, a psychologist; Friends and Lovers, by the anthropologist Robert Brain; The Nature of Human Aggression, by Ashley Montagu.

A Constructive Approach to Identification and Winning

A creative approach can also be made to the intriguing phenomenon of identification--the tendency to judge an individual or school by the win-loss record of an athletic team. We can begin by recognizing that this tendency is irrational: that no necessary connection exists between the fortunes of the team and the academic quality of the college or the personal worth of the players or other members of the college community. The philosopher Bertrand Russell rightly observed: "The belief that a young man's athletic record is a test of his worth is a symptom of our general failure to grasp the need of knowledge and thought in mastering the complex modern world."[51]

It helps also to remember that we can modify this tendency. We can redirect our identification to more valid objects--namely, the better qualities of the academic and physical education programs with which we are involved and which we constantly try to improve. This will be easier to effect if we make the same shift of emphasis in the college public relations program.[52]

---

[50] For valuable discussions of competition, see the following: Michener stresses the significance of competition in nature and society and outlines both its benefits and its dangers (Chap. XIII). Novak advocates competing with one's self and with others to attain motivation for maximum performance (Chap. 10). In The Ultimate Athlete, George Leonard shows how even such martial arts as aikido are based upon cooperation, rather than competition, as participants seek "universal harmony" (pp. 49, 53). In Chapter 7, he describes a variety of new games in which "competition adds spice to the proceedings," but in which there is no place for "worship of winning that currently defaces our national sports scene" (p. 128). In D.M. Landers, ed., Social Problems in Athletics, the social-psychological dimensions of competition are treated systematically by several scholars, who also provide extensive up-to-date bibliographies (pp. 3-56).

[51] Quoted in Betts, pp. 347-48.

[52] As a student-athlete commented, it will also be easier to do if the college lacks winning teams!

In this context we return to the issue of winning. Obviously, we can expect no easy answer. But we can at least discriminate between levels of importance. When I first went from a large university to a small college to develop a new educational program there, I was astonished at the concern of presidents of small colleges about the fortunes of their football teams. It was hard to fathom why it mattered whether Iowa Wesleyan beat Central or Central beat Morningside. If they had been Ohio State or the University of Michigan, it would at least have been comprehensible. But by no stretch of the imagination could any of them be considered big-time. (This was before post-season or divisional games were played.) Yet the presidents took football more seriously than they did musical, forensic, or dramatic events--and kept escalating athletic scholarships to get the edge on each other. At least in small colleges we should be able to put winning in better perspective. And this provides the answer to the analogy of the surgeon performing an operation. There is a crucial difference between even a championship game and a situation where life hangs in the balance.[53]

We need to decide what limits to place on efforts to produce winning teams. The pursuit of "excellence" by a history department entails no harmful side effects. But before a small college sets out to gain a more favorable win-loss record, we should scrutinize with care both the goal and the means of attaining it. As a preliminary principle, we might agree that if the efforts made to produce winning teams militate against academic values, they exceed their proper limits. We need a hierarchy of goals, a set of criteria by which to judge an athletic program. Winning will not be at the top.

But is this practical? After all, everyone loves a winner. True enough, but not the whole truth. We all have other loves. We love higher education, well-rounded persons, truly educated persons, ethical persons. We love humane people, including coaches. Our task is to strengthen these other loves and enable them to develop.

From this vantage point, we may distinguish three time periods in our attitudes towards winning. During a contest we shall try our best to win, throwing all of our energies into it as though it were a matter of great importance--subject only to the rules and good

---

53. But note the remark ascribed to Duffy Daugherty: "When you're playing for the national championship it's not a matter of life or death; it's more important than that."

sportsmanship. In terms of recreation, such concentration makes the game a true diversion; it frees our minds from the worries of the day. From the competitive standpoint, it enables us to challenge our previous limits and increase our capabilities.

The end of the game calls for a sharp change of attitude. We recognize what was true all along--that the individual participant is just as good or bad a person as before, whether the game was won or lost. The outcome has not altered his ability, his personality, or his character. The college also has the same positive and negative features as before. Nor has the outcome (in most cases) caused the world of everyday life to become significantly better or worse. Relevant here is the statement of President J. Lawrence Burkholder of Goshen College, which has an exemplary athletic program: "Goshen plays to win, and yet victories and losses are soon forgotten."[54]

Before the game begins, we retain our perspective. We will not engage in unethical practices, such as dishonest recruiting, as part of our long range preparation. Nor shall we expect the athletes to sacrifice their academic careers. Our preparation for specific contests will be aimed at making them truly developmental, educational experiences.

A game is much like a drama. Actors and audience become immersed in it; but before the curtain rises and after it falls, we all know it does not affect life outside the theatre. Of course one cannot distinguish sharply the three time sequences, and we are thinking in relative terms. Games vary in importance; the lives of coaches and professionals, for example, are affected by the outcome. Yet this approach should do much to put winning into its proper perspective.

---

54. P. 1. Some athletes in my "Issues in Sport" course contend that it is usually difficult, perhaps impossible, for a player to forget the game so readily. One suggests that to do this it would be necessary to modify one's intensity during the contest: "Throw all your energies into it but remember you are playing for the fun of it. Then the third step will follow the second smoothly." For the spectator it should not be so difficult.

V. RATIONALIZATIONS FOR A "WINNING ATHLETIC PROGRAM"

When one asks why a small college needs a winning team, four answers keep recurring. Each contains a grain of truth. Yet each is given far more weight than the evidence warrants.

Morale

Recently at a regional alumni meeting a college spokesman declared that one reason for maintaining a strong football program was to ensure good morale on campus. This is a common belief: that students, faculty, and administration will be more of a community and will have more pride in their school when they are winning. It will make the college a happier place in which to live or work. This is probably true--to a certain extent. A good deal of excitement may be generated by a winning team. On the whole, however, this benefit seems to have been exaggerated, as one learns by talking with students and faculty members on campuses where they have experienced both winning and losing seasons. What one discovers can be summarized as follows.

Obviously students and faculty members are happy to have a victorious team and regret having one that loses. But these reactions are evanescent. By and large they really don't care very much; it makes little difference in their day-to-day morale. To illustrate this point a campus leader at a typical college told me about several women students talking at lunch. One who dated a basketball player mentioned that the team had lost the night before. No one reacted at all. They simply went on with the continuing conversation. Even the students who are most interested, including the athletes, speak of the apathy of the student body in this regard. As one expressed it: "Sure, we get excited at the games, but we need a good deal of artificial stimulation to get us out there--pep rallies and so on, and even they are poorly attended." Campus morale is subject to variation from year to year. So are the fortunes of football teams. Any correlation between the two is usually very slight. This conclusion is not the result of a scientific study. It is simply my judgment, based on a good deal of observation and conversations with students and faculty members at many colleges. The reader is invited to check this opinion by his own observations and experiences.

A more important facet of this question of morale has been almost completely ignored in discussions of the issue. What are the effects of recruiting, subsidizing, and the other activities involved in attempting to produce winning teams? I am convinced that such a program often harms campus morale more than it helps--even if the teams win.

Subsidizing frequently leads to problems among the athletes. One small church college has recently begun recruiting athletes as part of a general expansion program. But several of the recruits are discontented and have been dropping out because they feel they are not being paid what they had expected. This has happened at several other schools (an instance of which we noted earlier). Neither morale nor enrollment has been helped. On several campuses the rivalry among players competing for the same positions has become bitter when certain players suspect their rivals are getting paid more than they. Another psychological factor is that when athletes are paid and put under pressure to win, they look on sport as a job. At one school, for example, the football players resent having to play the last game of the season, which is generally against a powerful non-league opponent. One of them said: "We are not getting paid enough to warrant taking a physical and psychological beating when it doesn't count in the conference standings."

Morale problems are also common among athletes in the minor sports. A typical case involves several good wrestlers who left the squad because, they assert, they worked as hard as the football players, had a longer season, and got paid little if anything, compared to an average of about $2000 the football players received. If no subsidies were granted, this problem would not arise. Another college has abolished subsidies altogether, convinced that they do more harm than good to the morale of athletes.

The harmful effect upon the morale of nonathletes is probably still greater. At one college several football players wantonly destroyed property and would have been hauled in by the police had the coach not intervened. Several girls with high scholastic standing complained bitterly that they received little financial aid while the athletic trouble-makers had full scholarships. Commenting on this incident, football players at another school agreed that such inequity should not prevail. Many similar cases could be cited in which athletes were not subjected to the same disciplinary sanctions as other students, or where they were given such special privileges as the personal use of college cars. A student government officer at one college declared he was glad the team had lost a few games because it "would pull the cocky players down a peg or so."

A good many nonathletes resent the discrepancy between the aid they receive and that given football players--especially when their need factor is greater and their scholarship better. These feelings do not come to the surface often, but when such inequities were revealed at a student government meeting on one campus, faculty observers described the bitterness that erupted as astounding. The students felt that athletes should play for the rewards intrinsic in the sport rather than for pay.

Able students tend to be critical of the athletic program not just because of their own financial interests, but because of the effect on the quality of the institution. They describe how the progress of the better students is slowed down in class because the professor must spend an inordinate amount of time on the indifferent ones whose only interest is to remain eligible. Of course most athletes want a real education, and the indifferent students are not all athletes. But enough fall into this category to exacerbate the problem. A different emphasis was made by a student who declared, "I know many people who resent the fact that their departments are being cut back but no apparent cut backs have been made in athletics. When I think of what the theatre department could do with a fraction of that football money--certain improvements that would make great strides in the program--I cringe."

The morale of thoughtful faculty members also declines as they witness the college devoting its resources to produce winning teams rather than intellectual quality. This was one of the factors which caused an outstanding faculty member to resign from his position at a church college. As he faced a difficult job decision, the athletic policy of the college, whereby its ethical and academic ideals were compromised, played a major part in his decision. Enthusiasm is difficult to measure, but it clearly diminishes when the faculty member has cause to question the basic values of the college. The assistant to the president of a vigorous, growing institution talked with me as he tried to determine whether to shift into the business world or eventually become a college president. He decided to enter business, partly because he saw colleges determining their athletic policies on the basis of public relations and economic factors; he felt that he might as well be involved in a business operation where the motivation was the same but more openly acknowledged.

Clearly the negative effects of the activities involved and atmosphere created by an athletic program that subordinates other values to victory often outweigh the benefits of winning, so that the chances of improving morale via athletic victories are rather slim. It would make more sense to expand our energies in ways that will be productive in proportion to the effort spent.

Insofar as morale and a sense of community can be developed by extracurricular events, a better method than spectator oriented athletics is to conduct programs in which large numbers can participate. For example, the University of South Florida held an Olympic Weekend, with a multiplicity of events ranging from egg tossing to a 440 yard relay--nearly all of them on a coed team basis, with something for everyone. An all-campus party topped it off.[55]

Swarthmore College has developed Oktoberfest, described as "a four-day swinging love-affair between Swarthmore and its students, faculty, administration, and alumni." It is sponsored by the Rapport and Support Committee of Student Council and the Office of Alumni Relations, in order to "draw together the many disparate groups on campus into a common enterprise, in the way that esprit is created around a faculty play." Events include group singing, folk and modern dancing, frisbee, volleyball, poetry reading, a tug-of-war, water polo, an obstacle race, bicycle racing, softball, a seminar on music composition, a game of capture the flag, sliding on a chute covered with soapy water, two movies, a concert, and a juggling contest![56]

Descriptions of these programs give the impression they may surpass even conference championships in generating campus spirit--and it may be more pervasive and enduring. It is, of course, more basic and important for college personnel to develop physical education and athletic programs in accord with true educational values and to improve the academic quality of the whole college. The result will be a college of which staff and students can be justly proud--where one may have confidence that morale will be reasonably high.

---

[55] Source: Burton H. Harres, University of South Florida (Tampa) Office of Housing.

[56] Swarthmore Alumni Issue, January 1977.

Recruiting Students

Another misleading assertion is that winning teams create an image that helps greatly in recruiting students. It does help recruit athletes and may attract a few avid sports fans, but students tell me that with others it seldom makes any difference. Some time ago a small college in Iowa decided to increase its subsidies in order to improve its win-loss record. It was argued that this would help it attract students. Yet that school had enjoyed a greater increase in enrollment than any of the other sixteen small colleges in the state, despite a losing record in both football and basketball for several years. Winning teams were obviously not essential for recruiting.

I asked the entire admissions staff at one college whether losing teams hindered their efforts. They were unanimous that it made no significant difference. Prospective students generally didn't know or care about the athletic record. Conceivably a student or so may have decided against that college without telling admissions officers the real reason. But if there were many like that, the staff would surely have been aware of it. When Southwestern College in Texas discontinued football because of the expense, most of the paid athletes left. But the recruiting of new students and total enrollment were not affected. A favorable result was a greater sense of community in the student body--unmarred by a special group of paid athletes.

The Hanford Report to the American Council on Education, published in 1974, contained an illuminating Appendix entitled "The Experience of Senior Colleges That Have Discontinued Football." Felix Springer, the author, concludes his study with this paragraph:

> When admissions were inquired about, officers said that...there were a number of variables involved and it was difficult to isolate the effect of discontinuing football. Almost all said, however, that the only noticeable effect was that no football players now applied. Almost all also seemed sure that giving up football had no other effect either negatively or positively on admissions.[57]

---

[57] Springer, p. 28.

Alumni Support

A frequently heard rationalization for joining the rat race to produce winning teams is that they are necessary to retain the interest and financial support of alumni, who allegedly exert great pressure on college officials. Studies of alumni giving at big-time schools corroborate this assertion. But it has very little application to small colleges, whose alumni, often more interested in professional or university teams, take the athletic fortunes of their alma maters less seriously. Some colleges have been pleasantly surprised to find that reduced emphasis on winning was accomplished with the full support of alumni.

A few years ago a small college whose basketball team was consistently at the top in national competition decided that such preeminence was costing too much academically and financially. The college drastically reduced recruiting and subsidizing, with the inevitable result: a mediocre win-loss record. I asked the president whether this created problems with alumni. He replied that some grumbling was heard at first, and the college may have lost a little money. But when he explained the decision in positive fashion at alumni gatherings, the response was quite favorable. The alumni were intelligent and reasonable enough to recognize that the true aim of the college was to help students develop intellectually and physically--not to recruit and pay a few specialized athletes. The net result was better alumni support than before. The president was clearly the key figure here. If he had feared the initial criticism and agreed that to lose games was dismal or disastrous, the change would not have occurred successfully. Standing on firm educational ground he spoke fearlessly and with conviction, thereby gaining alumni respect.

Even when they do not insist on winning, alumni may be avid boosters. Some time ago I was told that at Swarthmore College, where the football teams often lost by fifty or more points, alumni spectators got just as excited when their team made a first down as crowds elsewhere do at a touchdown!

Actually, insofar as there is pressure at small colleges or large, whether by alumni or others, the problem is not solved by producing winners. The tension is increased as the team wins. If a school ties for a conference championship, the pressure then is to win it outright, then to have an undefeated season, then to win a bowl game, and (above all) to keep winning. The school with the least pressure is the one with a 50-50 record, where there is no winning tradition to retain or recapture.

Publicity

Similar to the myths about morale, recruiting students, and alumni support, is the misconception that winning teams are necessary to publicize a college. There is a grain of truth here, but (as a president recently remarked) it is quite small. The more activities a college has, athletic or otherwise, the more "stuff" there is to work into publicity material. Except in unusual cases, however, even the winning team of a small college receives little notice in the media of large cities like Detroit. In small communities the newspapers will generally print any well-written releases, whether they concern athletics, drama, or academic activities. A small women's college with which I am familiar gets excellent publicity--with no intercollegiate teams. It has the two essentials: a varied, innovative program and an alert publicity director. Another factor to consider, as noted above, is that despite all its efforts, a college may field losing teams. These will scarcely provide the desired publicity!

VI. PRACTICAL STEPS TOWARD A SOUND PROGRAM

Introduction

Those of us who have been involved are convinced that values may be realized through intercollegiate athletics. Yet too often the harm outweighs the good because our priorities have gone askew. Many colleges pay a huge price financially, academically, and morally for giving top priority to victory. The benefits gained by this approach are largely illusory, uncertain, and fleeting.

Why do we tolerate such a situation? Is it not astounding that colleges committed to academic excellence and moral values, and which are currently facing financial deficits, continue to bear this added burden?

This is especially anomalous in regard to church-related colleges that aim at producing graduates "who have a sharply focused sense of values and are able to reify the ethical and moral standards of our Judeo-Christian tradition" and that claim "value-oriented higher education" to be their "distinguishing mark." In national church conferences on higher education, in the speeches of college administrators, and at individual colleges, the problems associated with athletics are scarcely mentioned, much less directly confronted.[58] It is important that we explain this extraordinary phenomenon, at least on the local level, for its causes must be taken into account if our specific suggestions for change are to be realistic.

The first explanation is simple: ignorance and inertia. Faculty members are deep in scholarly research, teaching and counseling. Students have a host of other involvements. Administrators are beset with multitudinous issues. We are all preoccupied with immediate needs and may be almost completely unaware of what is happening beneath the surface. If the problems of athletics emerge briefly, we take solace in one of the myths or rationalizations mentioned earlier and soon forget the whole matter.

---

[58] The quotations are from a resolution adopted by the National Association of Schools and Colleges of the United Methodist Church, January 11-12, 1975, reported under the title "National Association Seeks Wider Support from Colleges," Report: Higher Education and Ministry, p. 3. Cf. "Colleges in a Moral Fog," pp. 135-137.

Another reason is that in a small college all faculty and staff members know each other and hesitate to encroach on a friend's (in this case the coach's) domain. This is not a sound reason, for intercollegiate athletic policies deeply affect the entire campus in a way that the physics department, for example, does not. To suggest an evaluation of athletic policy seems to imply criticism of the coach or athletic director, although actually they are not primarily to blame; they are caught in a system for which they are not responsible. Very likely also the president has endorsed the athletic program (without being directly aware of its less savory aspects). Since members of the campus community are aware of the shortcomings of themselves and their departments, they hesitate to seem to throw stones at good friends or at those above them in the campus hierarchy. This is a personal, emotional factor, yet a powerful deterrent to change.

Several practical considerations of self-interest also deter action. In the last few years a new rationale has emerged for tolerating the heavy recruiting of athletes. The struggle for survival precipitated by declining enrollments has led administrators and faculty members, striving desperately to balance the budget or hold their jobs, to welcome any method of getting students. On one campus of a thousand students the athletic department takes credit for 60 percent of the entering men. This includes not only first string players who are paid, but also others who are not good enough for the first team but who will add depth to the program and may later develop into starters. Faculty members sigh with relief that at least someone is raking in the freshmen.

This is a short-sighted reaction, however. Some of the recruiting money might better be spent to improve the academic program. This would help the college to retain its superior students. Moreover, if the time, money, and energy spent recruiting athletes were devoted to recruiting star history or chemistry students, there is every reason to believe it would produce as many enrollees. And rather than lowering the academic level, such an emphasis would raise it, since the main object of the recruiting would be to secure quality students.

Another consideration is that a professor who questions athletic policy quickly gains the reputation of being "against athletics." This may decrease enrollment in his courses at a time when he cannot afford to let that happen. A more subtle, yet powerful factor may also operate: male members of the faculty may be considered (by themselves and others) less masculine if they do not support the brawn of the campus. To associate with those who represent the image of masculinity appeals to the ego of most men. This "machismo" factor may be entirely subconscious, yet decisive.

A basic reason we may hesitate to strive for reform is a recognition that sport reflects the society of which it is an integral part, so that ideally a radical change in society ought to precede radical changes in sport. This is doubtless true, but it applies equally to attempts to improve any aspect of social life--whether politics, business, or the family. Important as it may be to work for a whole new society, we cannot wait until that goal is attained. In sport, as in other areas of life, we need to make the significant improvements that are currently feasible.

The possibility of effecting the specific improvements we are about to suggest depends partly on the win-loss record of the college. Where the teams have been consistently below the .500 level, the school may welcome a change, feeling it has little to lose. The need for a change may be less, since the record may reflect the devotion of its resources to sound educational goals. A college with a somewhat better record--where wins and losses are about even--probably has its share of evils and may be ready for a new program.

A college with a winning tradition for several years would have many alumni who think of their alma mater primarily in terms of its athletic prowess and hence resist change. Many other members of the college community, basking in the aura of victory, will likely prefer the status quo. Moreover, sportwriters for the local papers are likely to lament any turn for the worse, as they would view it.

This may be the very school, however, that most needs change. It has probably been winning because of large expenditures for recruiting and subsidizing, as well as questionable methods of keeping its athletes eligible. It may have a young, aggressive coach, on his way to bigger things, who has persuaded the administration to give him the support needed to produce winners. Unless he has unusually sound educational convictions and has given real thought to these issues, the president has doubtless gone along with the coach, especially if there were no significant counter pressures. Yet when he is presented with a reasonable statement of the existing problems and future possibilities, the president may well be receptive to a more defensible program. Moreover, a sizable number of the ablest, most perceptive faculty members and students would probably welcome the sort of changes to be suggested here. Many are not especially impressed by a winning record and are at least vaguely aware of the toll it generally exacts. Even on such a campus a good deal of support may be anticipated for constructive improvements. At any rate the evils are usually so bad and the possibilities so exciting that it is worth a good try. There is little to lose and much to gain.

Minor improvements in a college athletic program can be made easily. They are also likely to be temporary. Gradually the college drifts back to its old practices. In this essay we are searching for a change sufficiently radical to provide a solid basis for a long-range program. We need to develop a comprehensive policy plus methods to implement it. At the outset one objection is likely to arise: "A re-ordering of priorities would be fine but other colleges in the league would not cooperate, or, having agreed at the start, would eventually break the regulations and take advantage of us in order to win." This observation is sound. A policy which depends upon other colleges is on a shaky foundation; it may or may not last--depending upon the others.

For the program advocated here to succeed over the long term, the college must make a unilateral commitment. It must determine what it will do, how it will do it--and why. It must formulate its own policy and, in general, its program. Then it may try to get others to join with it. The details of its program will depend somewhat upon others, but its policies and goals will not. This approach has been well expressed by a college president:

> Athletic conferences have produced codes for the guidance of their member institutions. All of these efforts have been helpful, but the basic problems can only be met at the level of the individual institution. It is in each institution that the problems exist and where the solutions must be obtained. If the individual college and university cannot solve its problem, all the resolutions and codes of either regional or national bodies will be but empty words.[59]

The president of a college in a western state took this attitude when the school drastically reduced its athletic scholarships and voluntarily retired from its big-time schedule. It secured releases from its schedule commitments, while remaining ready to join with any schools that would provide approximately even competition. Problems will be encountered with such a procedure, as with any other, but they can be handled successfully, as will be indicated later.

---

[59] Millis, p. 2.

Formulate Aims

Assuming a basic commitment, we may now suggest a positive program, how to implement it, how to maintain a satisfactory win-loss record, and what benefits various segments of the campus community could expect. The first step is to formulate the principles and goals for the intercollegiate program. The right attitudes and aims are of supreme importance, as providing the basis for making and adhering to specific improvements. Priorities must be determined--to clarify what will take precedence when aims conflict. Then decisions must be made according to the hierarchy that is established. Each college must develop its own statement, utilizing its unique resources as well as published sources familiar to physical educators.

The following guidelines, quoted or condensed from several sources, is not exhaustive, but may be suggestive.[60] There is some duplication--to show different ways of expressing the same idea:

1. The participant in the athletic program must receive significant educational value from the experience. It must not be assumed that this will be accomplished just because a program exists. Thoughtful planning is required.

2. The athletic program should reflect the school as a whole--its values, traditions, and faith.

3. Athletics are given academic dignity. The college should avoid

---

[60] The sources used: James Macholtz, Chairman, Department of Physical Education, Anderson College, Indiana, "Suggested Principles to Guide in the Development of Goals and Policies for a Program of Athletics," n.d., 11 pp.; Warren Fraleigh, Dean, Faculty of Physical Education, State University College at Brockport, N.Y., "Excellence and Athletics at Brockport," 1975, 6 pp.; Malcolm McLean, President, Northland College, Wisconsin, "The Playing Fields of Northland...," 1976, 23 pp.; J. Lawrence Burkholder, President, Goshen College, "We're trying to Take the Grimness Out of Sports," Goshen College Bulletin, March, 1972, 4 pp.

a dichotomy between cognitive and physical disciplines. Because athletics and physical education take the body seriously, they are respected. Coaches are qualified instructors with full faculty status.

4. The aim of athletic endeavor should be enhancement of the individual personality. It is not mastery over others; it is not to indulge in the vanity of being Number One; it is to help students learn more about themselves and develop an increased capacity to perform well under widely varying and challenging situations.

5. A program is successful when it attains its objectives. It should be stable enough to weather the cycles of wins and losses without being evaluated by them.

6. Scheduling policy should emphasize long-range parity of competition. The aim should be that teams or athletes in each contest have a reasonable chance to win or lose--depending upon whether they play at a qualitative level close to their potential.

7. The athletic program is best conducted in an atmosphere of even competition. This will provide sufficient setbacks to build character by testing ideals, and yet enough tangible success to serve as a crutch to promote further striving. This would usually mean winning half and losing half of the contests--on a long term rather than yearly basis.

8. The athletic program should be given the best efforts of coaches and athletes. In attempting to promote ideals it would be easy to lapse into a lackadaisical, "I-don't-care" attitude. Therefore, as a program of perspective is developed emphasis must be given to devoting full effort for a worthy goal. A competitive spirit that has competence as its goal rather than a "win spirit" must be developed.

9. The intercollegiate athletic program should be balanced, with a broad spectrum of activities. Financial resources and coaching time should be allocated equitably among all sports.

10. The intellectual objective of the college is to help its students learn to grow and explore as long as they live. Positive support should be given those athletic and para-athletic (hiking, camping) activities that can be continued in later years.

11. The aim is not to create semi-professional performers who are observed by the rest of the community. It is to involve actively as many students as possible. To this end, a vigorous intramural program is necessary.

12. The college will not countenance any form of discrimination on the basis of race or sex. Its athletic endeavors will result in equitable allocation of resources between men's and women's sports.

13. Athletics should be permitted to find their own intrinsic levels of interest and excitement. Athletic events are not to be prostituted for the sake of institutional prestige, money, or favor with the alumni or community.

14. The program of athletics should be self-motivating to as great a degree as possible. Athletes should desire to participate because of the inherent value of the program. Materialistic motivations should be kept to a necessary minimum. This has reference to awards and emphasis on championships.

15. We should not encourage the development of a group of highly subsidized "jocks" who may be looked on with envy or dislike by other students, and who may themselves feel isolated. Nothing can more rapidly erode the spirit of the College than to see it inflicting violence on its own stated principles. If our goal is truly the development of human potential, we should act accordingly and not indulge in professional recruiting.

16. A means of constant criticism and evaluation should be devised. Because the athletic program cuts across so many interested groups and concerns, it should be responsible to a group that represents all interests, such as a faculty athletic committee. Constant evaluation should prevent any major departure from the prescribed path toward the desired goals.

Evaluate the Work of the Coach

The attainment of such objectives depends largely upon the coaching staff. Because the coach is in such a crucial position, it is important to clarify what is expected of him--the criteria by which he is to be hired and evaluated, assuming that he will be given adequate job security and opportunities for personal fulfillment, as advocated in the next section.

The criteria appropriate to each campus can be worked out by the responsible individuals, including the athletic director and coaches, who have access to relevant literature. Since the task of the coach is basically to implement the type of institutional aims stated above, some of the criteria can be derived from such a list.

The coach should, of course, have a sound educational background, with reasonably high academic standing. He should have up-to-date knowledge of game strategy and other aspects of his sport. He should have teaching and communication skills so that he can impart his knowledge of the game and motivate players to do their best.

Additional factors especially relevant to this discussion include:

1. His coaching philosophy--its suitability for a program that puts educational and ethical goals above victories.

2. His emotional stability and sportsmanship. Does he maintain composure under pressure? Is his conduct a desirable model?[61]

3. His honesty and integrity--in dealing with prospective students as well as team members.

4. His relationship to players. Does he have their respect? Is he sensitive to their total well-being, so that he treats them as persons rather than as things? Does he give everyone a fair

---

[61] A particularly good statement was adopted in 1975 by the New England Intercollegiate Tennis Association. It reads in part: "The toughest thing to do is to continue to play fair when being cheated, but there is no other alternative for the true sportsman. Indeed, this is the real test of sportsmanship. So when your player says, 'What do I do when he starts cheating,' the answer is that the other player's cheating has nothing to do with one's own ethical standards. One is ethical or one is not--there is no middle ground" ("Ethics,", p. 1, formulated by Sean Sloane, tennis coach at Williams College).

The president of a small college in Pennsylvania, who was himself an athlete and then an official, gives his coaches full support, but requires them to answer to him if a technical foul is called against them.

chance? Is he an accessible and competent counselor?

5. His vocational aims. If he is eager to ascend the ladder to big-time or professional coaching, he would probably not be the proper choice.

Careful thought must be given as to whether "winning games" will be included in these criteria. I suggest that it should not be a criterion in itself, since it depends largely upon external circumstances, is too likely to be overemphasized, and could have either positive or negative implications. It should, rather, be considered as a possible indicator of other factors.

If a team wins or loses consistently, the opponents may not provide evenly matched competition. (See later section: Maintaining a Satisfactory Win-Loss Ratio.) Consistently winning teams may mean that the coach is a good strategist, a skillful teacher, has rapport with his players, or inspires respect from prospective students. Or it could mean that he is guilty of practices that produce winners but are harmful from an educational or ethical standpoint. Consistently losing teams may point to just the opposite factors. The responsible parties, including the coaches, should take all of this into account.

In assessing the work of the coach, it should be borne in mind that the most worthwhile human values are not subject to precise measurements and that the most important consideration is to have the right person for the job. The basic purpose of the evaluation will then be to help him develop in his position. The best approach is probably to treat each sport as a course, to be reviewed primarily by the squad members, assist coaches, and athletic director. Confidential written questionnaires could be utilized, as they are when academic courses and professors are evaluated.

Members of the Athletic Board and administrative officials should also make annual evaluations, based upon interviews with the participants as well as their own observations. The coach himself should be a party to the evaluative process and be encouraged to reveal his methods of dealing with athletes and with the problems he encounters. Everything considered, a fair and accurate assessment of the coach, based upon mutually agreed upon criteria, could be arrived at fairly readily. It would be at least as reliable as the evaluation of classroom professors.

Facilitate Fulfillment and Security for Coaches

A sound orientation to the new athletic program will not be easy to attain; it will need all the support that can be provided. The most crucial problem is posed by the fact that the new program may increase the risk of losing games. Usually about the only way the coach attains satisfaction and the recognition of others is by winning. He has been conditioned to equate excellence and success with victory. He has learned that if he "shoots up" an injured player and returns him to the game, he runs small chance of censure. But he will be praised for winning--or blamed for losing. A coach in a church-related college in Texas refused to send an injured player back into the game lest he become more seriously hurt. His team lost. He was a fine, high quality man, but at the season's end he was pressured to resign because he was not a winner.

Many cases have come to my attention of coaches who act from principle and from concern for the welfare of the players--sometimes at the risk of their popularity or their jobs. Especially in small colleges, they are likely to be of this high caliber. Coaches gain their most significant sense of fulfillment, of course, when they achieve the sort of goals outlined above for the athletic program and when they meet the criteria suggested for their positions. As their players perfect their skills and develop into ethical, mature individuals under their influence, conducting themselves with dignity in the face of victory or defeat, coaches can experience true inner satisfaction. This will come also from knowing they have the respect of the players and the college community.

Ideally, perhaps this should be enough; virtue is its own reward and the perfect embodiment of ethical values will live accordingly. But the coach is no more such an embodiment than the rest of us. The extent to which he will compromise under pressure naturally varies with the person and the situation. It is a matter of degree. In order to offset the pressures that beset coaches and players, creative imagination should be employed to devise further incentives and rewards for ethical, humane practices and to minimize rewards that tend to reinforce questionable values. The awarding of trophies for winning might well be questioned. Perhaps they should be abolished. Perhaps different trophies should be added--for sportsmanship and clean playing. An athletic director of one small college has suggested that several all-conference teams should be selected: the usual one based on ability, another that recognizes academic achievement, and one to honor sportsmanlike conduct. Several colleges designate an "athlete of the week"; perhaps a "sportsman of the week" should be chosen as well.

Seasonal athletic banquets provide an excellent setting for implementing the new aims. At these events it is customary to highlight various kinds of effort and achievement. A group of athletes has suggested such an occasion as an appropriate time to commend a coach for making decisions on the basis of principle. This would help him feel that any sacrifice involved was worthwhile--that he need not be just a tough "practical guy." Recognition could likewise be given to athletes who lived up to high ethical standards on and off the playing field and, as a basketball coach expressed it, "to those who gave honorable competition and lost." Good sportsmanship by coaches and players could also be emphasized in college publicity and the student newspaper.

Another way for members of the athletic department to attain a good measure of fulfillment would be through the expansion of their programs made possible with the funds and energy saved by cutting back on recruiting and financial aid (as advocated in the next section). The coach, in particular, will also have an enhanced sense of achievement in proportion as he is given responsibilities related to the total educational process--beyond his immediate job. Having close contact with many students, he is often able to understand them better than other professors. With an important contribution to make, he should be recognized as a valued, integral part of the college community.

Such recognition should be given tangible form by an adequate salary and the assurance that raises will be forthcoming comparable to what a coach in the customary situation would receive by producing winners. The coach must also have full faculty status, or at least comparable job protection. Although coaches in the better small colleges usually have this type of security, it is lacking in many others. Above all, the coach should be assured that the support of the new policy and program by the president and athletic director will not fluctuate with the win-loss figures. A student put it this way: "One reward would be to relieve him of a negative reinforcement: that of losing his job. Make it clear that his job is not just to make winning ball clubs but to pursue the educational goals of the school. If this is done to the satisfaction of college officials, regardless of winning record, the chances of loss of job are slim. By eliminating this constant pressure and threat the coach is rewarded."[62]

---

[62] Cf. H.A. Scott, "New Directions in Intercollegiate Athletics," p. 34. "It is in strengthening the hand of the professional personnel in charge of athletics that the college president can wield his greatest influence."

Eliminate Special Financial Aid

If the coach is to be judged primarily by the win-loss record, fairness requires that he be provided with the means of producing winners--plenty of financial aid for his athletes and an adequate recruiting budget. But if the above suggestions have been followed--if the aims of the program and the criteria for the coach's job have been established so as to guarantee that his vocational security and means of fulfillment do not depend upon victories--his function and the whole program can be made truly educational in nature. This requires that two crucial steps be taken.

The first is the elimination of special financial aid for athletes. This raises several problems. One is that officials of many colleges profess to follow this policy already, when in fact they do not, although their conference rules may appear to require it. This need not imply deception or the deliberate breaking of rules. By accepting certain definitions or rationalizations, staff members may be quite sincere in their assertions and practices.

On one campus a coach declared publicly that no athletic scholarships were given. A faculty member assured me this was the case. But several athletes had already told me the amounts they received solely for playing football. This was confirmed by the athletic director. When I questioned the faculty member, he defined an athletic grant as one that was not channeled through the financial aids office. Investigation revealed that all aid was so channeled, but that each coach was allotted a total amount to be distributed among his athletes at his discretion. There were some overall limitations, but the student had to be on the squad to receive the grant.

A financial aid officer who really wants to do so can determine fairly readily whether preferential treatment occurs at his or her school. The average amount of total aid provided, let us say, to the starting line-up in football can be compared with the aid given students of similar point average, financial need, and extracurricular (but not athletic) participation. It is also instructive to note whether aid is withdrawn or reduced after a student drops out of a major sport. Some conferences require the type of comparison suggested here and prohibit the withdrawal of aid from athletes who drop a sport; but statistics provided by colleges do not always reflect what really occurs, and seldom is an attempt made to enforce conference rules of this type. On such issues officials of different colleges tend to support one another, since they realize the difficulty of making accurate distinctions and are not always sure that the practices at their own schools are without fault.

A reasonable justification for preferential financial aid to athletes is that they spend up to 40 hours per week on their sports. Hence they are unable to take paying jobs, whereas most nonathletes have much more time to study or earn money. This poses a real dilemma; to pay for athletic participation seems unfair to nonathletic students, especially if they are involved in time-consuming extracurricular activities for which they are not paid; on the other hand athletes may really be underpaid in terms of the time and effort expended, and sometimes students are paid for nonathletic activities.

The question arises whether aid should be given on the basis of extracurricular activities. Athletics would be included, for example, along with music and drama. A college that goes this route would need to make sure that grants were distributed evenly among the various activities. It would be essential that alumni not be allowed to upset the balance by designating funds for athletics beyond the proper proportion. With sufficient safeguards, limited financial aid might be provided on this basis. The system would probably remain subject to abuses, however. The safest policy is that all students who take part in extracurricular activities should do so without pay. Then athletes will be genuine amateurs. Incidentally, if athletes are not paid and winning is less crucial, the players and coaches will be more inclined to reduce the burden on the players by devoting less time to preparation between contests.

Reduce Recruiting

With less pressure to win and no special financial aid to offer, the second step can be taken: recruiting can be cut back to its normal proportions. The coach will be as free to recruit as any other faculty member, but will not be required to do so. Nor will he be given a special budget or be relieved of other duties to do it. Recruiting will no longer be his main duty. This policy should lead to fewer dropouts among athletes, since they will have come for educational, rather than financial reasons. Funds available for recruiting will be channeled through the admissions office or the various departments, according to what is best for the college as a whole.

VII. IMPLEMENTING THE NEW PROGRAM

The most important aspect of the new program is commitment to the sort of aims outlined above--aims that most educators already accept, but which get smothered by the pressure to win. Then when provision for the security and fulfillment of the coach have been worked out and decisions about financial aid and recruiting have been made, the next step is to make the program operate effectively.

Role of the Athletic Board

Crucial at this point is the college athletic board. The fact that it is often called a "board of control" indicates that it has been viewed as a counterforce to the thrust of the athletic department to put winning games above the educational aims of the college and the welfare of the athletes. That function should no longer be necessary. Instead of trying to hold down an irresistible force, the aim of the board now becomes that of supporting a momentum that is basically in the right direction. The board can thus become much more effective than it has usually been. In addition to staff evaluation the board should help to determine policy and to implement the new program, as well as initiate steps to improve it.

Each college must decide how to administer the total program. It seems to me that the director of athletics should be responsible for it and held accountable for its operation. Because many facets of the college are involved and because the new program is innovative, a plan should be devised for surveillance of its different aspects--to render encouragement and deal with problems--beyond the periodic checking done by the athletic director. The people in charge of different functions should report to the athletic board in person every college term:

1. The director of admissions would describe methods of making sure that standards are maintained and athletes are given no special consideration.

2. The financial aids officer would provide information about allocation of aid and the work-study program.

3. The director of publicity would give and receive ideas regarding news releases and feature articles.

4. The trainer and doctor would discuss the prevention and treatment of injuries.

5. The academic dean or appropriate faculty committee chairman would report regarding any possible deviation by athletes from the curriculum best suited to their graduation and vocational plans.

The chairman of the athletic board should be one who is sensitive to the potential problems of intercollegiate sports; he should not be a member of the department of athletics. In view of the ambitious agenda of the board and its importance to the whole college, the chairman should have a reduced teaching load. Board members should include tenured faculty personnel who would be in a position to make independent judgments without having to be concerned for their own security. They should be chosen by faculty vote in order to forestall their being appointed or dropped according to whether they were docile or critical. The board should include members of the administration and student body as well as professors.

The same considerations apply to membership on the financial aid (or scholarship) committee. The experiences of two small denominational colleges in Iowa illustrate this point. In one case some faculty members on the committee were afraid to criticize the current policy because they did not yet have their doctorates and felt insecure. Another member was dropped from the committee because he questioned the granting of large sums to athletes of mediocre scholastic ability in preference to a girl valedictorian who had greater need. At the other college the local Chamber of Commerce and a prominent business firm offered to donate athletic scholarships. The offer was politely refused, largely through the influence of the scholarship committee. The members felt that acceptance of the funds would endanger their policy of not giving athletes preferential treatment.

Maintaining a Satisfactory Win-Loss Ratio

Sooner or later the athletic board may need to face the question of whether a college that operates on the principles we advocate can win enough games. The problem this poses was stated thus by former President Brewster of Yale (in reference to Yale's admissions policy of giving preferential treatment to athletes): "Yale students should not go into game after game...with the feeling that they don't stand a chance. That is bad education, it is bad individual psychology, it is bad institutional morale."[63]

We may grant that when a team is clobbered by practically all of its opponents every year, the athletes are having a one-sided, depressing experience. The problem becomes less serious, however, when we adopt the philosophy that winning is not everything. Losing will not then be viewed as a dismal, dreary, disappointing, disheartening, distressing, or disastrous debacle--to use sports-column jargon. (Four of these words were taken from eight lines of a single article in the Yale Alumni Magazine; three appeared in a phrase in the Macalester College Weekly.) Most of the despair over losing results from too much emphasis on winning. When a quality college that subordinates athletics to academics loses a football game 45-0, the team and community are not pervaded by the same gloom that overshadows Columbus when Ohio State is defeated 13-12. After all, they figure, "The only thing lost was a ball game; there were some plus factors in the experience, and there are more important things in college and in life."[64]

We need to consider also what a satisfactory win-loss record would be. Such a record should be attainable by all of the colleges in a given group. It would obviously be unsatisfactory for half of the colleges to win nearly all of their games, for then the other half would lose nearly all of theirs. But if half of them win about fifty percent of the time, the other half will win about as often. From the standpoint of the whole group, a reasonably satisfactory situation would exist when the teams, putting forth their best efforts, win between 35 percent and 65 percent of their games over a period of years.

Bearing these factors in mind we must still recognize that the

---

63. Quoted in Sleeper.

64. This quotation is from a small college student sports announcer. Commenting on this paragraph, an athlete wrote: "You can see it in practices. Here every little mistake will not possibly cost you the ball game, so the pressure is less. You don't feel nearly as bad when you do something wrong, because you can correct it before the next game. If this type of attitude was maintained in a game, the feeling you get from losing would be less and you would strive to do it better the next time rather than sulking now."

program that has winning as its highest goal and pays the most for its athletes will usually win more often than the one that provides no athletic grants and puts other values above winning. The college that changes from the first category to the second, as this essay advocates, is in danger of losing too many games--if everything else remains the same. The crucial point, however, is that everything else need not remain the same. The picture may change in significant respects, resulting in a satisfactory win-loss record. The first few considerations and suggestions that follow point towards a solution to this problem. The final suggestion, followed with a little patience, would virtually guarantee a solution.

One significant difference in the new situation might well be better team morale. Athletes who came to the college without pay would not have the financial complaints to which we have already called attention. They could have a certain pride in being amateurs. Pat McInally, referring to his experiences as an All-American at Harvard, put it this way: "The players in the Ivy League may even love football more than the players at the big schools. That's because they're under no obligation to play. There are no scholarships."

More democratic methods could be initiated to help players realize the program was theirs. When a coach was to be hired, they would have a part in the selection process. Members of the team would feel free to make suggestions to the coach. They could choose more of their own plays and perhaps have a part in selecting the starting line-up. From the ethical standpoint the gap between profession and practice is a morale-sapping factor that would be greatly reduced.

These factors, of course, would make little difference at the major athletic powers. All the morale in the world will not make up for the sort of stars Notre Dame is able to buy. An assistant football coach there rightly observed that if they stopped recruiting they would be 0-11 for the season. A walk-on there is practically unheard of. A small college, on the other hand, is unable to buy real stars. Some players are paid nothing and few have full-rides. The differential in ability that would be lost by eliminating athletic grants could be at least partly compensated for by better morale.

Another factor is that some able high school athletes do not want the pressures of a big-time school, nor does the ordinary small college program appeal to them. College recruiting personnel assure me that some of these athletes would be attracted to a progressive program in tune with valid, defensible objectives. One college that was accustomed to losing seasons shifted to the sort of program advocated here, with the result that two or three football players of exceptional ability enrolled and they had a .500 season. Other athletes who might not be so outstanding prefer a situation where reduced pressure to win makes the game more enjoyable and leaves them more opportunity for academic pursuits. Moreover, the coach in this program, with more time, energy, and money at his disposal, could devote himself more fully to creative coaching, with a consequent improvement in team performance.

While the factors just mentioned should be given due weight, the college still may not win a reasonable proportion of its games. Consistently losing records, as one coach expressed it, may occur because the school has "been trapped into playing colleges with an entirely different philosophy simply because they were old rivals, in the same geographical vicinity, or in the same conference."[65] An important next step, therefore, is to seek to persuade other members of the conference to adopt similar policies--both individually and by joint action. Others might well follow suit, at least to some degree, and the conference might be influenced to put greater emphasis on the true values of athletics. Many colleges are sufficiently dissatisfied with their present emphases to be willing to make changes. The support of a conference and efforts in the same direction by the schools on one's schedule can help reduce the pressure to be always at the top. Yet sufficient cooperation of this type may not be forthcoming. More drastic action may be necessary.

Fortunately, there is a way to be reasonably certain that the teams will win about half of their games. This is to revise schedules so that, on the whole, contestants will be evenly matched. Of course, the teams would not always be equal, but in the long run those that happen to be better would be balanced by those that happen to be worse. (To meet a few stronger teams will provide the challenge that stimulates improvement.) Even when colleges have commitments several years in advance, an honorable release for valid reasons can

---

65. Elverson, p. 6. This is a ten-page statement prepared in 1974 by the head football coach at Swarthmore College. See also p. 10, where Elverson describes how Swarthmore had losing football seasons in the late 1920's and 1930's "until teams of comparable size and strength could be scheduled," whereupon its fortunes improved.

generally be secured. Pride may cause an athletic department to hesitate to eliminate more powerful opponents. But neither the old or new opponents are of big-time caliber, and only coaches, athletes, and a few super-fans know the relative rankings of small colleges. The important thing is arranging competition as evenly as possible.

Arranging a more appropriate schedule need not always mean dropping out of the conference. Often a college plays just about as many nonconference as conference games. By choosing nonconference opponents with care, it could probably end up with a reasonably satisfactory win-loss record. Or it might leave its own conference and join a more congenial one. Or it might become an independent. Although the latter route has certain disadvantages, these would be outweighed by the greater freedom and other advantages of the new program as a whole. In fact, an independent college is spared much of the hassle that takes the time of conference members. If it is not pleased with a competitor, it can simply drop it from the schedule.

The question might arise as to whether a college could find enough other schools of similar philosophy to work out a full schedule. The task would be made easier by playing the same competitors more frequently. Two different groupings of eastern colleges, for example, play the same football teams twice in one season. The main answer to the question, however, is that the opponents would not need to share all of the same commitments (although such sharing would be a plus factor). Opponents would be chosen primarily by the level of competition they provide and their congeniality in such respects as clean playing. Whether, or to what extent, they paid their athletes would not be a major consideration. The touchstone would be what happens on the playing field.

Generally speaking, of course, as a school moved from a higher to a lower level of competition, its opponents would tend to be those of similar policy and practice. A fringe benefit for a college following the new program would be the establishment of relationships with academically superior schools, in view of the inverse correlation often noted between academic quality and powerful teams (See Appendix B). This might open the door to beneficial cooperation in other respects. In any event, these various factors and suggested procedures should prove adequate to make up for the loss in talent the new program might entail.

Substituting Soccer for Football?

As it evaluates the total program, the athletic board should consider periodically what sports the college should sponsor. Most of the problems associated with intercollegiate athletics are related to football. Yet few small colleges have evaluated their football programs to determine whether they are better than alternative means of fulfilling college objectives. In view of the growth of soccer in recent years, now is the time to raise the issue and, if a substitute is advisable, ask whether soccer should fill that role.

Appendix I of the Hanford Report, by Felix Springer, is relevant at this point, for it deals with the experiences of senior colleges that have discontinued football. The major reason for dropping it was financial. The cost was too high to maintain or to justify in terms of filling the needs of students either as participants or spectators. Another reason was the discouragement caused by losing seasons, plus the recognition that pouring more money into the program would not insure winning.[66]

Most colleges that dropped football did so reluctantly. Yet administrators generally sighed in relief to be rid of the source of more problems, as Springer puts it, "than all the other intercollegiate sports combined." In particular, they were glad to see the sport dropped "because of the corrosive effects they saw football having on values." Having been sadly aware of "the academic compromises" that tended to "skew value patterns in a bad way," they found that without football it was "easier to keep academic work the high priority on campus."[67]

For the most part, possible harmful effects that had been feared did not materialize. Springer writes:

> All schools were greatly concerned about the effect the cessation of football would have on alumni giving. The experience of almost all schools was that it had no significant negative effect and in some instances had

---

[66] Springer, pp. 7-8.

[67] Ibid., pp. 26-27.

> considerable positive results. The schools invariably were careful about explaining to alumni the financial exigencies that caused them to give up football, and the vast majority of the alumni were understanding. They responded to the real present-day dire circumstances. Some, however, held out for a nostalgic past, a hopeful future, or an impossible dream represented by Notre Dame. At a few schools a vocal minority expressed outrage and vowed to cut off funds from the university. At these schools the feeling was that the amount of money these alumni had been contributing was negligible and that it had all gone to the football program anyway.[68]

Fund raisers at several schools report that discontinuing football aided their efforts. Businessmen, state appropriations officials, and foundation administrators considered the step an example of good stewardship. They responded favorably to this practical recognition of the hard realities of a tight budget. The fear of losing prospective students also proved groundless--except that football candidates have not applied; they have been replaced by others.[69]

Neither Springer's study nor my observations of alumni giving and fund raising have been strictly scientific in nature. Since many variables are involved, it is hard to be sure that a certain event (discontinuing football) was the major cause of a specific result (increased giving). Furthermore, the colleges we are discussing had the worst experiences with the sport; they had more to gain and less to lose than colleges that have had winning seasons and other positive experiences. Most of the colleges Springer studied were small or medium sized; some had relatively big-time programs, but they were not among the top powerhouses of the nation. At universities like Ohio State, where national recognition is involved, alumni are more excited about football, become more identified with it, and give it greater support. There one finds a positive correlation between winning seasons and alumni giving; to drop the sport would doubtless cause a decrease in donations. But they are not our present concern. My observations of small colleges confirm Springer's conclusions that financial support, public relations, and enrollment are not adversely affected when football is discontinued.

---

[68] Ibid., pp. 11-12.

[69] Ibid., pp. 13-14, 27-28.

In virtually every case a major positive effect of dropping football has been the improvement and expansion of other aspects of the athletic program.[70] Often about the time it was recognized that football did not really satisfy the needs of many students and that the expense associated with it was resented by some, an increased interest in intramural sports was developing. It was appropriate that a significant part of the large sum previously spent on football should be used for intramurals. Existing space and equipment have been made more available and new facilities have been provided. Sports have been added and new instructors have been hired. Women's sports have benefited in similar fashion. Funding for women's activities can be greatly increased with only a small fraction of the discontinued football budget.

Other intercollegiate sports have also gained. Generally those of most value for a student's later fitness and enjoyment--such as tennis, swimming, and golf--are the step-children of the athletic department because they attract little spectator interest. But with additional funds they can be given more attention. Sometimes administrators give increased funding and emphasis to basketball--a visible spectator sport--to assure alumni and the general public that the college is still interested in varsity athletics. It also fulfills the desire of students for an exciting sport to watch. It costs only from one-fifth to one-tenth as much as football. Yet in several respects it is a viable substitute for the latter.

An even more appropriate substitute, because played during the same season, is soccer. Since it may be the key to their better future, I shall develop at some length the idea that many small colleges would benefit greatly by dropping football and making soccer their major fall intercollegiate sport. By far the most widely played game in the world, soccer is rapidly becoming more popular in this country. This is true at every level. It is a game that arises almost spontaneously among children. The United States Soccer Federation reports that from 1971 to 1977 its membership among kids rose from 15,000 to over 500,000. Those best in a position to know estimate that probably another half million youngsters play the game who do not belong to the USSF. In Dallas alone the number of school

---

70. Ibid., pp. 11, 14-17.

children who play it has increased in recent years from 300 to over 50,000. As Joseph Durso, New York Times sportswriter, declared recently: "Soccer is replacing football as the all-American game in the schoolyards of the nation."[71]

With this grass roots basis in the suburbs, it is not surprising that in colleges it is the most rapidly growing team sport. Attendance at professional games in 1977 was over two million, an increase of 32 percent over 1976. Both the New York Cosmos (with Pelé) and the Minnesota Kicks (without him) reported average attendance of over 32,000 per game, the peak being a packed stadium of close to 78,000. Often attracting more fans than baseball, basketball, or hockey, it is being accepted much more rapidly than was predicted by even the ebullient Pelé, so that such competent observers as Pete Axthelm agree that the game--at all levels--is here to stay.[72]

Each reader may compare and contrast the two sports in terms of their benefits to the student and the institution. My view is that intrinsically soccer is at least as valuable as football and that any merits it may lack are more than compensated for by its educational, ethical, and financial advantages. A major advantage is that those in charge of a soccer program would feel less impelled to do off-campus recruiting. The primary reason is that a smaller squad is required. The same players handle both offense and defense, one player can substitute in several positions, and fewer injuries mean less need for substitutes. Whereas the football squad of a small college often numbers seventy or more, twenty-five is adequate for soccer. A special factor, often overlooked, is that a typical student body contains a much higher percentage of potential soccer players. Suppose a student population of 600 men contains 150 versatile athletes--men with agility, coordination, speed and endurance. Nearly all would have the potential for soccer.

---

71. See: Durso, "School of Very Hard Knocks," p. 49C; Cascio, p. 2; Axthelm, p. 83; "Inflation Sport," p. 45; "Potentials," p. 119.

72. Regarding colleges, see: Intercollegiate Athletic, Physical Education and Recreation Programs: Report Number Four, pp. 6-8; Bocca, p. 8; Gardner, p. 237. Regarding professional soccer, see: "Newsmakers," p. 52; Shrake, p. 18; "Pro 'Football' Gains Fans." See also Axthelm, Cascio, and "Inflation Sport."

In the 1974 season one of the top scorers in the nation was a short 135-pound member of the SUNY-Buffalo team. A much smaller number would qualify for football, which requires the size, weight, and bone structure adequate for the bodily contact involved. To get enough good football players much more special recruiting is necessary. By reducing the need to recruit and the attendant temptation to subsidize, a soccer program lessens the likelihood and range of the evils to which these activities give rise.

Not only because of the potential savings in recruiting and possible subsidizing, but also in other ways soccer is much less expensive. Fewer squad members means fewer uniforms. Moreover, uniforms and equipment cost much less per person than the armor required for football. Since injuries occur less frequently, medical costs are reduced. The smaller squad cuts travel cost more than half. Instead of the equivalent of two or three full-time coaches, a soccer team can be coached on a part-time basis by one person (a professor of mathematics at Carleton; a professor of German at Kalamazoo). Fewer officials are used at games. Soccer is tens of thousands of dollars per year cheaper than football. Incidentally, the economy, safety, and simplicity of soccer account for the favor it finds with parents and school boards.[73]

From the educational standpoint soccer has the advantage of requiring considerably less than the 30-40 hours per week that football demands. Students who take their academic work seriously can include soccer in their schedules much easier than they can football. Because soccer depends more on improvisation than on complex, precise game plans, less time is needed for analyzing films and studying detailed plays. Practice on the field takes less time because the players get winded more quickly. Except for scrimmage periods, football involves more standing around, watching others, etc. Soccer also requires less time before and after practice--for taping, suiting up, and treating injuries.

The time factor was a major reason that Chris Ellerbroek, star quarterback for two seasons at Cornell College, shifted to soccer his third year. This enabled him to retain his "A" average in rigorous pre-medical studies. After playing football for ten years he also wanted a "change of pace." He said that he experienced in soccer "an exhilarating sense of freedom" that is lacking in "foot-

---

73. See Axthelm, p. 83.

ball, with its heavy padding, many interruptions and emphasis on size and weight." Soccer, he added, was "more informal and relaxing," and the team was composed of "interesting people... attracted to the game because of its qualities and not because of society's pressure to compete."[74]

A further consideration is that soccer is more appropriate than football as an intramural sport--for both men and women. A varsity team stimulates interest throughout the student body, leading to an expanded intramural program. The latter, in turn, becomes a fruitful training and recruiting ground for the varsity. In fact, it is often advisable to start it as an intramural or club sport to generate enthusiasm for launching it on a varsity basis.

My next point is a matter of opinion, where the evidence is not crystal clear; yet insofar as it is valid it is important. Physical contact is not as prominent in soccer as in football. There are plenty of collisions and some injuries; like basketball, the game can be quite "physical." But the collisions are usually accidental. The focus is on the ball, whereas in football, opponents deliberately slam into each other on every play. Because of this difference, the expression of violent and sadistic tendencies is much less in soccer. When it does break out, the official penalty is quite severe--a free kick by the opponent. Hence there is less opportunity and temptation deliberately to inflict injury (in the numerous ways familiar to all football players), causing physical harm to the opponent and moral harm to the one who does it. A good many players contend that certain qualities needed to produce a superior football player--notably anger and hatred--cause a person to deteriorate as an ethical, sensitive, human being. As one expressed it, "The game is making an animal of me." This cannot be ignored by colleges which profess a concern for student values.

An observation from the notebook of a student is pertinent here. He calls attention to the close relationship between football and the military outlook. After criticizing the latter he continues, "Football characterizes our society, but maybe out society should change... Who knows, maybe our whole military philosophy--'win or nothing'--will be less characteristic of our attitudes in the future. If so, I can't see football remaining the national pastime as it is today. Soccer will become more popular."

---

[74] "Gridder Finds Freedom in Soccer."

While soccer has many advantages over football, a few questions must be faced regarding its feasibility. One is whether enough colleges have teams so that an appropriate schedule could be arranged. In the country as a whole, nearly as many colleges compete in soccer as in football. The situation varies according to locality; in some areas it is not very common.[75] Yet seldom would this be a serious problem. If necessary, each team could be played twice, so that four opponents would suffice. Or a college could travel longer distances the first year or so. Gradually the problem would be solved as new schools took up the sport. A related question is whether a college could field enough reasonably good players, since some high schools do not offer soccer. Although more students have the potential for soccer than for football, beginners will naturally not be as good as experienced players. Since most other colleges in a given area would be in the same situation, and since more high schools add soccer each year, this handicap would also be temporary.

A more complex question is whether soccer is as interesting and exciting to watch. Would it have enough of the drawing power of football to be a focal point for school spirit? Since athletics should be primarily for the participants rather than the onlookers, and since football is less of a unifying factor than many imagine, the spectator appeal should not be a crucial issue. It is worth investigating briefly, however, from the practical standpoint of facilitating the change we are considering. Of course, for a sizeable proportion of student spectators the game is not the chief attraction. They go for social reasons, to mingle with the crowd and see friends. Regarding the comparative allurement of the two sports little real

---

75. The NCAA Annual Reports: 1976-77, in the section on Division III (291 smaller colleges), p. 14, lists 218 colleges sponsoring soccer and 204 sponsoring football. The National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics membership list,1976-77 (525 small colleges) lists 193 sponsoring soccer and 239 sponsoring football. Soccer predominates in New England, Middle Atlantic, and Southeastern states. Football predominates in the Northwest, Rocky Mountains, deep South, and northern and western part of the Midwest. Between N. Carolina and Missouri, the numbers are about equal. Colleges sponsoring both are primarily in S. California, Minnesota, and Pennsylvania. For maps showing the per capita participation in high school soccer in the various states (for 1971-72) and the number of colleges sponsoring intercollegiate soccer teams (in 1970-71) see Ball and Loy, pp. 82-83.

evidence is available. Football has the advantage of being firmly established as the number one fall attraction. The plays and scoring are probably a bit more spectacular, and it has more appeal to the sadism in all of us. But in terms of skilled performance, small college football is a far cry from the perfection of the pros, with which both college sports are competing.

Several students who have not played football, especially women, have told me that soccer appeals to them more, as being simpler and easier to understand. Some even find it more exciting than football because of the constant motion. Some prefer it because the brutality of football repels them. Since the number of spectators at small college football games is often unimpressive, it may be that soccer would attract just as many. It certainly generates excitement (often too much!) in Europe, Britain, and South America, where over 200,000 attend regional and international matches.

Perhaps football has more current appeal only because we have grown up with it. As fans become more familiar with soccer, it may overtake football. The gap seems already to be narrowing. Witness this report in the Haverford College alumni magazine:

> The Homecoming game against Stevens was a good one too.... An unusually large crowd, including members of the college's board of managers and the Alumni Council, braved the rain to watch it....The excitement was contagious; the whole crowd went up in the air together and came down screaming![76]

The potential seems to be there; but even if soccer should not prove quite as exciting as football, I believe the advantages in other respects far outweigh this factor.

Perhaps the question most likely to arise is whether, if soccer is substituted for football, the problems and evils related to the latter will be transferred to the former. It is true that as a college develops a better soccer program, enthusiasm and identification with the team will grow and each school will tend to escalate its efforts to defeat the others. This will be conducive to the same pressures and temptations to compromise that we described in connection with football. But three important points should be noted.

---

[76] Bell III, p. 16.

First, the significant aspects in which soccer differs from football are basic and permanent. These include the smaller squads, the lack of size and weight requirements, sharply lower expenses, less preparation time required, and less violence. These act as safeguards that set limits to the realization of the chief evils. Consequently, there will be a significant difference in degree between the problems associated with soccer and those associated with football. Even if the new program we have advocated earlier were not followed, there would be less recruiting, subsidizing, and keeping players eligible by questionable means--simply because there would be fewer players. This difference in degree is of major importance.

The second point is that insofar as evils creep into the soccer program, it will be some years before they become serious. It takes time for major rivalries to build up. Part of the pressure comes from a tightly knit structure extending from the professional level through colleges and high schools to children's teams. In his illuminating study of the contemporary interscholastic sports scene, Martin Ralbovsky writes:

> There is no structural hierarchy in soccer in America...the soccer coach, like the boys, would be liberated from the overbearing tradition that descends from the higher levels of the game. There is no soccer tradition in America.[77]

Football is so closely interrelated with society that a small college finds it difficult to adopt a relatively independent approach to the game. It can do so, but it is easier in respect to soccer, which has not yet developed the stereotypes, legends, and super-coaches that tend to rigidify a sport. As a New Jersey 10-year-old exclaimed, "In soccer you don't have these crazy coaches yelling 'Stick him, hit him' all the time."[78] It will be a good many years before soccer finds itself in this condition. Even if we could forsee that evils would develop, it would make sense to enjoy a better situation as long as we can. If necessary in the future, radical changes can be made again.

---

[77] Ralbovsky, pp. 227-228.

[78] "The Kids: Having a Ball," p. 83.

Thirdly, we should acknowledge that although the evils associated with athletics could be greatly diminished by substituting soccer for football, this would not really solve the basic problem. It would reduce the severity of the disease (well worth doing) but not by itself get rid of the disease. The basic solution is the change in objectives, attitudes, and philosophy already advocated in this essay. This can be facilitated, and the situation meanwhile ameliorated, by eliminating the sport (generally football) that is the focal point of the wrong attitudes. If a college already has the right philosophy and objectives plus the necessary determination, it could conduct a sound program in either football or soccer.

Thus it becomes evident that the degree of improvement to be expected by substituting soccer for football would vary at different colleges. Some would scarcely need to take the step. Yet even they might find it advantageous, especially from a budgetary standpoint. Everything considered, it is clear that for most small colleges, several factors--ethical, educational, and economic--point towards giving serious attention to this matter. To quote a football player at a school of a thousand students: "I think that the arguments and evidence supporting the replacement of football with soccer are quite valid."

Publicizing and Interpreting the Program

Whatever decisions are made about which sports the college will sponsor, the operation of the new program will be facilitated if it is properly and fully interpreted to the college constituency. Everyone on campus, including incoming athletes, should be informed of the reasons for, and benefits of, the shift of emphasis--so should trustees, alumni, parents, local sportswriters, broadcasters, and the general public. News releases, alumni magazines, catalogues, brochures, and student publications afford fruitful channels for creative innovation, as do radio and television programs and addresses by college officials. On the fifty or sixty campuses I have visited as a speaker, I have invariably read the student paper and other descriptive literature. Only once or twice have I encountered an attempt to evaluate intercollegiate athletics. One reads only of win-loss records, the abilities of players, and prospects of future victories.

The field is wide open for imaginative treatment of both positive and negative aspects of the fascinating world of sport. Ethical dilemmas faced by the coach and players could be portrayed. Basic issues on the national scene, as exemplified locally, could be discussed. The cumulative win-loss records of coaches might well be omitted altogether.

The winning or losing of games would be treated in ways that did not equate them with success or failure. Excellence would be interpreted in terms of enjoyment, quality performance, and achieving one's potential. A group of basketball players who discussed such an approach felt that it would attract high school athletes who are often weary of the authoritarian methods to which they have been subjected.

The new type of stories would be more interesting as well as more educational than the usual recital of statistics. They would aid the college by calling attention to its distinctive athletic program and its capacity for innovation. That the program was different would need to be stressed, because college literature often includes idealistic (and innocuous) statements about athletic aims and policy. In fact, a problem involved in this sort of publicity is that of making sure it is not mere window-dressing and that the campus community does not mistake words for action. Realistic, continuous interpretation will provide significant support for the new direction being given to athletic endeavors.

VIII. EXEMPLARY CASES--HERE AND IN ENGLAND

Because each situation is unique, the particular features of a sound athletic program will vary at different colleges, and one can never be sure that athletes are not given some type of preferential treatment. Yet it should be illuminating to note a few colleges with basically constructive programs. Included here are two larger institutions, certain aspects of which might well be emulated by small colleges.

The largest is the University of California at San Diego, with 11,000 students. No athletic grants are awarded and very minimal funds are provided for recruitment. Some coaches do additional recruiting at their own expense. The main recruiting is done on campus by searching out students who can contribute to, and benefit from, varsity competition.

At San Diego, about 1,000 students take part in thirty intercollegiate sports, the budget for which is smaller than that of the intramural program, which has about 4,000 participants. Without gate receipts or booster clubs, these programs are funded by student registration fees channeled through the general budget. Hence there is no financial incentive to favor spectator sports over the others; none are considered "minor." In fact, primary emphasis is placed on sports suitable for lifetime participation. It is significant also that since the men's teams are basically amateur, the women are under no pressure to become professionalized in order to keep up with the men.

At the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the picture is much the same: little pre-enrollment recruiting, no subsidizing or gate receipts, a very large number of intramural and intercollegiate teams, an overall win-loss record of about .500. The competition in both intramural and varsity sports is often quite intense. In the sports for which their opponents recruit extensively, MIT generally loses more than it wins. In other sports, however, it often has winning records.

The facilities are much more extensive and the budget a great deal larger than at San Diego. Unlike the latter, whose coaches are almost all part-time, MIT has an ample staff and a core of full-time coaches. Although careful budgeting is necessary, a long tradition and many successful alumni mean that sources of funds are available that San Diego lacks. Both of these larger schools manage to have strong sports programs, while avoiding the evils generally found where heavy recruiting and subsidizing occur. This can be accomplished even more readily in small colleges.

Of particular interest is the program at Hampshire College in Massachusetts. A coeducational school of about 1,200 students, Hampshire first enrolled students in 1970. Starting from scratch, it had no stadium, winning tradition, or other impedimenta. The innovative characteristic of the college includes the concept of recreational athletics. With no recruitment or subsidizing, the program is largely student initiated. Guidance and assistance are provided by a Director of Recreational Athletics and by "instructors" (not coaches), who work mostly with such individual sports as kayaking and the martial arts.

A survey by the social science division of the college reveals that participants are usually more interested in exercise and relaxation than formal competitive athletics. As the Hampshire catalogue states, the accent is on "trying to do one's best rather than trying to be the best." Yet competition is available within the college for those students who wish to organize it, and the Ultimate Frisbee Club and soccer team have competed beyond the local campus.

An extensive Outdoor Program includes such activities as backpacking, rock climbing, skiing, and bicycling. These are often related to academic courses--for example, exploring dinosaur tracks or following Thoreau's route up Mount Katahdin. Expeditions have been taken to Alaska and New Mexico, as well as to less distant points. Many women who had not been involved in athletics in high school take part in the outdoor activities and sports at Hampshire.

Genuine progress in accord with basic priorities is evident in recent developments at Northland College--a church-related school in Northern Wisconsin with about 725 students. As changes in curriculum, student body, and financial circumstances took place, college officials realized that the intercollegiate athletic program should be examined.

A twenty-three page report to the trustees was produced, together with a fifteen-page cost analysis and related memoranda. The report included a perceptive statement of the philosophy and aims of intercollegiate athletics at Northland, the NAIA code of ethics, a fact sheet about each sport, and specific recommendations. As a result, the college discontinued football, effective in the fall of 1976, and is reallocating its resources to expand other aspects of its program.

The values of football were recognized--for the participants and for the institution--in terms of admissions, public relations, and campus social life. On balance, however, the benefits of the move seem clearly to outweigh the disadvantages. Intramurals are increasing and stress is being placed upon life-long athletic and physical education pursuits appropriate to the northern location near wilderness areas. The college is strengthening its environmental studies, in which it has pioneered. It is expanding its winter sports and it has established an outdoor education major, which is developing much better than would have been possible if financial and other resources were being diverted into football. The college may be a little more unified psychologically and academically.

Forthright and constructive action is also being taken by Whitman College in the state of Washington. In recent years Whitman's intramural, club, and intercollegiate sports have been burbeoning--particularly soccer, rugby, and women's athletics. During the same period, football was becoming more specialized and costly in money and staff time. After years of evaluation and trying to meet the needs of the total program on the one hand and football on the other, the latter has been discontinued. This was done for the specific purpose of shifting "resources from the intercollegiate football program to the rapidly growing sports activities of the college" (President's memorandum, February 28, 1977). More generally, according to the statement released by the Board of Trustees, the purpose was to strengthen the overall intercollegiate athletic program by dropping a losing and enervating sport.

The important point about Northland and Whitman is not that long football traditions have come to an end, but that the colleges examined their total recreational and athletic needs in the light of their distinctive educational missions today, and acted creatively. At other colleges, under different circumstances, the answer might be to retain football and integrate it into the whole program in such a way as to minimize negative aspects and maximize its educational benefits.

Other characteristics such colleges often have are:

1. The coach's job does not depend upon winning; hence his tenure is generally longer and he can identify with the college and its goals.

2. The benefits colleges often seek in vain by trying to produce winners are actually attained. Altogether, the colleges dis-

cussed above received publicity via the Chronicle of Higher Education, Sports Illustrated, the New York Times, the Associated Press, and the news service of the Christian Science Monitor, plus extensive regional coverage. Campus morale is enhanced and prospective students are attracted by innovative programs. On the other hand, winning teams sometimes repel prospects of lesser athletic ability who see no place for themselves.

3. Recruiting is done on campus among students who came for an education at that college and who may need some prodding to try out for the team. They get a chance at the varsity competition denied them when practically all team members are pre-selected.

In this connection it is revealing to note the meaning of "excellence" to the Boston University track coach, who (like hundreds of others) professes that as his goal. During the 1977 season he complained that he could not attain excellence with so few track scholarships to grant that he had to resort to recruiting within the university. He did this so well that he interested about 65 freshmen in the track program and won about half of his dual meets. Frustrated in having to "settle for the middle," he pressed for more grants, and for the 1978 season lured some top talent from Europe and Africa as well as the United States. From an educational standpoint, we may ask which is more truly excellent: the 1977 season, which involved becoming acquainted with regular students, introducing them to new experiences, and helping them develop latent capacities--or importing stars, winning more meets, and paying less attention to the amateurs who were encouraged the previous year?[79]

---

[79] "Track: Aiming Toward Excellence," pp. 30-31; also Dunphy, pp. 11, 13. Some of the most serious problems arise when administrators or coaches try to escalate their programs into a higher division or level of competition. (See story of Honest John Taggart in Michener, pp. 174-183.)

The importing of stars from abroad is done chiefly by large universities, notably Washington State and the University of Texas at El Paso. Their runners come primarily from places like Nigeria, Kenya, and Uganda. The practice is now spreading to smaller schools. A member of a Big Ten tennis team that toured the South reports that in the spring of 1977, four varsity tennis

While track coaches from Boston, Washington, and Texas are beating the bushes in Africa and Europe to get the edge on other track coaches, we might look overseas with a different purpose. Since English colleges and universities are not plagued with the evils that beset intercollegiate athletics in the United States, let us ask to what extent, if any, we could emulate their programs.[80]

The values of the English experience are several. Interscholastic competition at the secondary level and intercollegiate athletics receive much less emphasis. Except for the Oxford-Cambridge boat race, which draws a small crowd, few spectators attend inter-university contests, and the typical student is scarcely aware of them. The most intense competition is not between universities, but among colleges within universities (at Oxford and Cambridge).

Organized recruiting is nonexistent. Since the government provides for the support of all qualified students who need it, athletic scholarships would be unnecessary even if they were desired--which

---

players at Northwestern State College of Louisiana were from Chili. They lived in athletic dorms, were barely able to communicate in English, and did not take a regular schedule of classes their first year, since they were concentrating on tennis and learning English. At Nicholls State University, Louisiana, four members of the tennis team were from Europe or Mexico. Howard Payne University, a small Southern Baptist college in Texas is among those recruiting in Ghana. For a summary of this trend, see Van Dyne, pp. 1, 7.

80. Sources: Personal visits to England, especially a lecture tour to several schools and a three-week lectureship at Woodbrooke College, affiliated with the University of Birmingham, where interviews with Charles Jenkins, a professor in the Department of Physical Education, were quite helpful. This section also profited from critiques by Claude Eggertsen, Professor, Social Foundations Program, School of Education, University of Michigan, and Sir Eric Ashby, former master of Clare College at Cambridge University.

Among relevant books are: Goodhart and Chataway; McIntosh, Physical Education in England Since 1800; idem, Sport in Society; Mitchell, Natan.

they definitely are not. The athlete receives no favored treatment academically; there may even be a slight bias against him by professors who question his ability to handle both his sport and his studies.

Coaching is done by professors, townspeople, or old grads in their spare time. Chosen by the players, they receive no pay. Hence they are under no financial or vocational pressure to produce winners. Where organized physical education departments exist, it is not unusual for the professors in them to teach also in other departments. At the University of Birmingham, for example, they are fully qualified members of the philosophy and sociology faculties.

Oxford and Cambridge have such a tradition of academic excellence that there is little danger it will be subordinated to athletic prowess. They have inherited also a view of sport as recreation rather than a means of asserting superiority, entertaining spectators, or training professionals. It is an avocation for amateurs. Other English universities also take justifiable pride in keeping physical education courses and athletic programs in harmony with basic educational goals. They do not produce professional athletes.[81]

In a different milieu, colleges in the United States should not be expected to duplicate those in England. Yet the attitude towards sport prevalent in English universities is directly relevant to our needs and urgently deserves our attention. This attitude is reflected to some extent in the Ivy League. The reflection is rather pale, however, as exemplified (in 1976) by the stated intention of the Yale University Commission on Athletics to reemphasize the revenue, spectator, fund raising, and publicity values of the Yale athletic program. In recent years, alumni have put considerable pressure on the university's corporation, administration, and admissions office to remedy what the Commission refers to as the "dismal" win-loss

---

81. Cf. Dawkins, p. 34: "In America...the sole object in participating is to win, and...the average or mediocre athlete is discouraged from participating. In Britain...the important thing seems to be playing the game and enjoying one's self." Dawkins was an All-American halfback who studied at Oxford as a Rhodes scholar.

record of Yale teams.[82]

The issue here is whether a college should depend on its athletic teams for a sense of identity. In 1976 the most outstanding debater a certain small college had ever produced, a sophomore, discussed with the president the college plan to save $2,500 by releasing an able, well-trained debate coach, leaving the debaters to coach themselves. She explained that such a move would impel her to transfer in order to achieve her potential in national tournaments and to receive the training adequate for a career in teaching and coaching. The president was unresponsive to her needs, but waxed enthusiastic about a last minute touchdown that brought victory to the college the preceding Saturday. Financial aid for a first string football player there averages about $2,500 a year. Over 80 players are suited up for home games.

Not every U.S. college could be, or should be, a small Oxford. But with proper leadership, liberal arts colleges could increasingly attain their sense of worth by identifying with superior teaching and intellectual endeavors rather than victory on the field. Several of them are now effecting this transition.

---

82. See Jones, especially pp. 2-5, 12, 13, 45. This commission and other (chiefly alumni) groups that have expressed great concern over Yale win-loss records also recognize the ethical and educational values and goals of athletics. The question is whether these values are compromised when renewed emphasis is placed on winning, in order to attain financial, spectator, and "image" values. And is it fair to other outstanding applicants that preferential treatment is given athletic applicants (who are also good students)?

One might also question whether the Ivy League universities, the attraction of which need not depend on athletic victories, should support the tendency to judge the worth of individuals and institutions by the fortunes of athletic teams. Should they not, rather, challenge this trend?

(Between 1969 and 1974, Yale's overall win-loss record against all competition ranked it 6th or 7th each year among the eight Ivy League schools. Columbia ranked 8th each year. The others probably had athletic policies that were less defensible from an educational standpoint.)

Another way that we can emulate the English would be to give students more participation in decision-making, particularly in the selection and retention of coaches. This would counteract the tendency to exploit athletes for the sake of the coach's career or the public relations of the college. We could also require that our coaches have academic training beyond the bachelor's degree--at least in physical education. This should outweigh achievement as a star athlete or a winning record in high school coaching or experience with a professional team. Conflicts arise when a coach is concerned only with his team's performance and has little sympathy with academic pursuits.

IX. BENEFITS OF THE NEW PROGRAM

The examples cited above and the English experience support the contention that the approach advocated in this paper is practical as well as innovative. Implemented decisively, it is more realistic than the unimaginative course most colleges follow--expending great effort to produce winning teams, with only a 50-50 chance of success. This becomes more evident as we review its chief benefits.

A noteworthy advantage is that it relieves college personnel of at least some burdensome pressures and conflicts. For this reason a coach who identifies himself with his present college and wishes to remain there, and who views his task as part of the total effort, will be likely to welcome the program advocated here. It will enable him to live a reasonably normal life, more subject to the irrational judgments of the crowd than the rest of us, but no longer having his future depend upon the health of a quarterback or the direction of a wind current. His wife and children will have a better prospect of remaining in the same community and school system for a satisfactory period of time.

The financial aid officer, admissions director, and registrar can follow their best insights as professional educators, and faculty members can treat all students alike without fear of being considered "against athletics." Students will be relieved of the pressure to cheat in order to keep up with a group of favored athletes. The president and trustees will be less tempted to compromise academic standards in order to satisfy cracker-barrel quarterbacks. They will have a clear-cut, defensible position to maintain. A major benefit, declared a small college coach who read this essay, would be "a sense of consistency and integrity that would rightly encompass the campus individually and collectively."

Some of the alumni will doubtless grumble a bit, but most of them will be relieved to realize they need not feel personally humiliated when the team loses. The public relations director may regret losing the publicity that a winning team facilitates, but he might well gain national recognition for the college by publicizing its creative approach to a perennial problem area.

The most significant advantage of the new program--and this is the real touchstone by which to judge it--is that it will facilitate improvement in the total educational task of the college, as well as in the athletic domain. A special benefit is that it should help solve the practical difficulties involved in providing better opportunities for women in athletics. An obvious problem is that of greatly expanding the funding for women without cutting the budget for men so much as to handicap them in the competitive rat race. By stressing competition less, the new program will greatly alleviate the situation while releasing funds, some of which can be used for women's sports. Moreover, it will no longer be crucial for the men to use facilities for such long periods or at the most strategic times. Reducing external pressures will make possible a more rational allocation of facilities and equipment.

Although not as clearly recognized as the need for money and facilities, a more important problem is emerging in women's sports: As women gain the better opportunities to which they are entitled, how can they avoid the major evils that plague men's intercollegiate athletics and seriously detract from the attainment of the true goals of higher education? This problem will be more difficult to handle in the large universities, but it will affect smaller schools as well. To the degree that we improve the men's program along the lines suggested here, we shall be making a significant contribution to the emerging women's movement.

In regard to both men's and women's athletics, James Macholtz, Chairman of the Department of Physical Education, Anderson College, has listed some changes that might be effected by the new approach:

1. There would be no need for hate or anger, since our goal would not be to outdo someone else.

2. Opponents could better treat one another as human beings.

3. More of the coach's attention could be directed toward attaining true developmental goals.

4. Coaches would not be forced to manipulate athletes to be highly motivated in a short period of time for scoreboard winning; they could work more toward self-motivation, which is a gradual process.

5. Coaches could give the players more opportunity for self-direction in planning and game strategy.

6. The tendency to make material achievement a god (trophies, publicity, etc.) could be side-tracked in favor of more valid personal and social goals.

7. The temptation to cut corners on rules in order to win would be greatly reduced.[83]

A further advantage of a more creative athletic program is that the college can show that it has a distinctive function--that it need not merely mirror its surrounding culture. It will benefit society as a whole by fulfilling its obligation to question, and sometimes challenge, prevailing mores and values. Some of the worst aspects of our culture are exacerbated by practices and attitudes emanating from professional sports--infecting business and political life as well as athletics at all levels: notably resorting to violence and exploiting others in order to become Number One. The college can provide support to parents, high school teachers, and others who are striving to create a climate conducive to better standards. As history professor Richard Birdsall of Connecticut College, states: "I see the liberal arts college as an island of sanity in an ocean of madness."

Even if a college already follows the principles advocated in this paper, it would usually benefit by making its athletic guidelines more explicit. Such clarity would help prevent changes in personnel or circumstances (such as a few losing seasons) from causing its program to lose its distinctive flavor.

A number of colleges will not find these proposals readily acceptable. Some are unaware of the extent of the educational, ethical, and economic costs of their programs. Others have such favorable win-loss records that they find it more convenient to rationalize the status quo than to question the methods that produce the victories. If a coach is not committed to a career in a quality small college, but wants to advance to the big-time, he will probably not favor these suggestions, for a winning record will produce more job offers than competence as an educator. Still other personnel or political factors may hinder attempts at change in a given situation.

Despite cases of this sort, my talks with administrators and coaches have convinced me that most colleges would be willing to consider these proposals seriously. By and large they recognize the undesirable effects of pressures from the surrounding culture.

---

83. This list is slightly revised and condensed from the original, which appeared in Macholtz, p. 6.

In view of the potential benefits to various groups and individuals within a college community and its larger constituency, the new program would stand a good chance of winning ample support.

It would doubtless have imperfections and entail some disadvantages, but these should not be considered reasons for rejecting it. It should be judged not by some perfect standard, but by comparison with alternatives, particularly the present situation. The crucial question is whether the benefits would outweigh the disadvantages. Usually they would. The problems in most colleges are serious enough (though not always recognized as such) to warrant giving it a good try. It should help give the college community a sense of purpose, conducive to greater unity and enhancing morale. It could be a very creative and enriching experience.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

ACADEMIC POTENTIAL AND ACHIEVEMENT OF ATHLETES

Considerable research has been conducted comparing athletes and nonathletes in respect to intelligence and academic achievement. Much of this has dealt with personality characteristics also. An especially illuminating study is: Lowell Cooper, "Athletics, Activity and Personality: A Review of the Literature," Research Quarterly 40 (1969): 17-22. Cooper's analysis of twenty-five research reports dealing with high school and college athletes reveals a remarkable degree of coherence among the studies. Although some ambiguities, inconsistencies, and unsolved problems are evident, Cooper's own summary seems clearly justified: "While no intellectual differences were noted, a greater motivation to achieve was noted among athletes. Generally the personality features of athletes pointed to greater social adjustment and ascendency."

Cooper's conclusions, confirmed by most of the other relevant studies, suggested that if there were no special pressures to recruit them, entering freshmen athletes would score somewhat higher on achievement tests and then do better in college than nonathletes. But as one research team states: "The athletic group at the college level consists of a significant number who ordinarily would not attend college if it were not for a scholarship. Consequently, these students may not achieve as much academically as other students." (Billy E. Davis and Richard A. Berger, "Relative Academic Achievement of Varsity Athletes," Research Quarterly 44, 1973:59.)

See also Michener, who summarizes (p. 241) conclusions of James Coleman and Richard Rehberg which support the findings of Cooper. At another point he writes that most of the athletes he has known "would have been an adornment" intellectually at any college or university. Then he continues: "But there is another group, and a most numerous one, composed of young athletes physically able to play for any college but mentally prepared for nothing more advanced than the fourth grade" (p. 199).

In his report to the American Council on Education, George Hanford writes: "It is generally admitted that in the big-time, scholar-athletes on the average have lower . . . test scores and academic predictions than other students at the time of admission" (p. 131). An analysis of SAT scores of incoming freshmen at a large university is reported in Richard A. Berger and Donald H. Littlefield, "Comparison Between Football Athletes and Nonathletes on Personality," Research Quarterly 40 (1969): 663-665. I made such a comparison at a small college. In both cases, the entering athletes had lower average SAT scores than nonathletes. A much greater sample would be needed to draw any implication as to the percentage of colleges (large and small) where this is the case.

APPENDIX B

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ACADEMIC QUALITY AND ATHLETIC SUPREMACY

Many observers have asserted that an inverse correlation often exists between academic excellence and winning teams. Although conclusive proof is lacking and many exceptions may be cited, my judgment corroborates this--particularly as regards spectator sports. The most relevant documentation that I have encountered is David Roper and Keith Snow, "Correlation Studies of Academic Excellence and Big-Time Athletics," International Review of Sport Sociology 11 (1976), Issue 3: 57-68.

In this careful, unpretentious study, the authors rank the leading powers in football and basketball (based on Associated Press polls and major bowl and tournament victories) over a five year period (1968-1972). They also rank the leading colleges and universities in terms of academic excellence. From the various possible measures for this, they chose the SAT scores of entering freshmen and A Rating of Graduate Programs, by K. D. Roose and C. J. Anderson (American Council on Education, 1970). A Study of the Roper and Snow tables, particularly the one on which the rankings are listed together, supports their tentative conclusion that on the whole a negative correlation exists between academic excellence and athletic supremacy. For the most part, the powerhouse football and basketball teams were not at the top-ranking academic institutions.

This study dealt only with large universities. The authors advocated further investigations that would "improve on our results," particularly some that would "separate out schools of different student body size." Such studies could test their belief that "most of the small colleges with strong big-time athletic programs are ranked quite low" academically. Further inquiry could also help determine whether "large schools are able to simultaneously promote athletics and academic excellence more easily than can small schools" (p. 67). If this is true, the negative correlation would be even greater with small colleges. Incidentally, in concluding their report the authors "urge an expansion of athletic programs for all students coincident with curtailment of big-time athletics."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books and Pamphlets

Ardrey, Robert. *The Territorial Imperative*. New York: Atheneum, 1966.

Ball, D.W. and Loy, J.W., editors. *Sport and the Social Order*. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1975.

Benagh, Jim. *Making It to #1*. New York: Dodd, Mead, 1976.

Betts, J.R. *America's Sporting Heritage*. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1974.

Brown, Roscoe C. "Race, Sport, and Academe." Appendix D in Hanford.

Cozens, Frederick, and Stumpf, Florence. "The Role of the School in the Sports Life of America." In *Sport and American Society: Selected Readings*, edited by George H. Sage. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1970.

Denlinger, K. and Shapiro, L. *Athletes for Sale*. New York: Crowell, 1975.

Durso, Joseph, et al. *The Sports Factory*. New York: Quadrangle Books, 1975.

Everson, Lew. *Small College Football--With or Without Padding: A Survey of Small College Football*. Privately Printed, 1974.

Edwards, Harry. *Sociology of Sport*. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey Press, 1973.

Evans, J. Robert. *Blowing the Whistle on Intercollegiate Sports*. Chicago: Nelson Hall, 1974.

Gardner, Paul. *Nice Guys Finish Last*. New York: Universe, 1975.

Gaylin, Willard. *Caring*. New York: Knopf, 1976.

Goodhart, P. and Chataway, C. *War Without Weapons*. London: W.H. Allen, 1968.

Hanford, George H. An Inquiry into the Need for and Feasibility of a National Study of Intercollegiate Athletics. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1974.

Henry, Jules. "In Suburban Classrooms." In Radical School Reform, edited by Ronald and Beatrice Gross. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1969.

Intercollegiate Athletic, Physical Education and Recreation Programs: Report Number Four. Shawnee Mission, Kansas: NCAA, 1974.

Ireland, Bernard P. "New and Changing Circumstances Which Have Influenced the Conduct of Intercollegiate Athletic Programs in the United States. Since 1930." Appendix F in Hanford.

Jones, Gerard E., Chairman. Report of the Yale University Commission on Athletics. (56 pp. mimeographed) 5 March, 1976.

Landers, D.M., ed. Social Problems in Athletics. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1976.

Leakey, Richard and Lewin, Roger. Origins. New York: Dutton, 1977.

Leonard, George. The Ultimate Athlete. New York: Viking, 1975.

Lorenz, Konrad. On Aggression. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1966.

McIntosh, Peter. Physical Education in England Since 1800. London: G. Bell & Sons, 1968.

McIntosh, Peter. Sport in Society. London: C.A. Watts & Co., 1963.

MacKenzie, Marlin. Toward a New Curriculum in Physical Education. New York: McGraw Hill, 1969.

Meggyesy, Dave. Out of Their League. Berkeley: Ramparts, 1970.

Michener, James. Sports in America. New York: Random House, 1976.

Mitchell, B. Today's Athlete. London: Pelham Books, 1970.

Montagu, Ashley, editor. Man and Aggression. New York: Oxford University Press, 1968.

Montagu, Ashley. The Nature of Human Aggression. New York: Oxford University Press, 1976.

Brain, Robert. Friends and Lovers. New York: Basic Books, 1976.

Natan, A., editor. Sport and Society. London: Bowes and Bowes, 1958.

NCAA Annual Reports: 1976-77. Shawnee Mission, Kansas: NCAA, 1977.

Raiborn, Mitchell H. Financial Analysis of Intercollegiate Athletics. Kansas City: NCAA, 1970.

Ralbovsky, Martin. Lords of the Locker Room. New York: Peter H. Wyden, 1974.

Savage, Howard J., et. al. American College Athletics. Bulletin No. 23. New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1929.

Scott, H.A. Competitive Sport in Schools and Colleges. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951.

Scott, Jack. The Athletic Revolution. New York: The Free Press, 1971.

Shaw, Gary. Meat on the Hoof. New York: Dell, 1972.

Springer, Felix. "The Experience of Senior Colleges that have Discontinued Football." Appendix I in Hanford.

Tutko, Thomas and Richards, Jack W. The Coach's Practical Guide to Athletic Motivation. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1972.

Periodicals

Aigler, Ralph W. "Report of the Committee on Athletics." North Central Association Quarterly, 29 (October 1954).

Association Notes and Editorial Comment. "A Statement of Principles on Intercollegiate Athletics." North Central Association Quarterly, 29 (April 1955).

Axthelm, Pete. "The New Kick." Newsweek, 18 July 1977.

Bee, Clair. "I Know Why They Sold Out to the Gamblers." Saturday Evening Post, 224 (2 February, 1952)

Bell III, B.F. "A Hoondred Yarrds." Horizons, December 1972.

Berger, Richard A. and Littlefield, Donald H. "Comparison Between Football Athletes and Nonathletes on Personality." Research Quarterly, 40 (1969).

Bocca, G. "Pelé." Family Weekly, 21 August, 1977.

Burkholder, J. Lawrence. "We're Trying to Take the Grimness Out of Sports." *Goshen College Bulletin*, March, 1972.

Cascio, Chuck. "How Soccer Can Become a Major American Sport." *New York Times*, 29 February, 1976. Sport Section.

"Colleges in a Moral Fog." *Christian Century*, 1 February, 1950.

Cooper, Lowell. "Athletics, Activity and Personality: A Review of the Literature." *Research Quarterly*, 40 (1969).

Davis, Billy E. and Berger, Richard A. "Relative Academic Achievement of Varsity Athletes." *Research Quarterly*, 44 (1973).

Dawkins, Peter, "We Play to Win: They Play for Fun." *New York Times Magazine*, 24 April, 1960.

Dunphy, Art. "Boston University Entering New Era in Athletics." *Boston University Today*, Fall 1977.

Durso, Joseph. "School of Very Hard Knocks." *New York Times*, 15 November, 1977.

Durso, Joseph, et. al. "Sports Recruiting." *New York Times*, 10-17, 24 March, 1974.

Edmonson, J.B. "Athletic Policies of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools." *North Central Association Quarterly*, 27 (October 1952).

Edmonson, J.B. and Youngert, E. "Report on Athletics Submitted to the Commission on Colleges and Universities, 1954." *North Central Association Quarterly*, 29 (October 1954).

Eldridge, Larry. "Competition, Not Records, Keeps Brock Playing." *Christian Science Monitor*, 20 January, 1975.

"Gridder Finds Freedom in Soccer." *NCAA News*, 15 October, 1975.

"Inflation Sport." *Forbes*, 15 August, 1974.

Johnson, Charles O. "Intercollegiate Athletics." *North Central Association Quarterly*, 27 (October 1952): 18.

Keating, James W. "Athletics and the Pursuit of Excellence." *Education*, 85 (1965).

"Kids: Having a Ball." *Newsweek*, 18 July, 1977.

Lardner, John. "My Case Against Sport." *American*, 152 (October 1951).

Lewis, Guy M. "America's First Intercollegiate Sport: The Regattas from 1852 to 1875." Research Quarterly, 38 (1967).

Lewis, Guy M. "Theodore Roosevelt's Role in the 1905 Football Controversy." Research Quarterly, 40 (1969).

Macholtz, James. "Will Sports Survive 'The New Athletics'?" NAIA Coach, Spring, 1971.

"Marshall Seeks Professorship--After Baseball." Lenawee Tribune, 3 January, 1974.

Meylan, George L. "Harvard University Oarsmen." American Physical Education Review, 9 (1904).

Millis, John S. "Intercollegiate Athletics: The College Show Window." Key Reporter, May, 1952.

"National Association Seeks Wider Support for Colleges." Report: Higher Education and Ministry. P.O. Box 871, Nashville, Tennessee, February-March, 1975.

"Newsmakers." Newsweek, 29 August, 1977.

Ogilvie, Bruce and Tutko, Thomas. "Sport: If You Want to Build Character, Try Something Else." Psychology Today, October, 1971.

"Oktoberfest Was Fun." Swarthmore Alumni Issue, January, 1977.

Paterno, Joe. "A College Coach Tells Why Recruiting Abuses Happen." New York Times, 17 March, 1974. Sport Section.

Phenicie, Steve. "State Champions in Both 1963-64." Adrian Daily Telegram, 23 March, 1973.

"Potentials." Quest, January-February 1978.

"Pro 'Football' Gains Fans." Michigan Daily, 21 July, 1977.

Roper, David and Snow, Keith. "Correlation Studies of Academic Excellence and Big-Time Athletics." International Review of Sport Sociology, 11 (1976), Issue 3.

Scott, H.A. "New Directions in Intercollegiate Athletics." Teachers College Record, 58 (1956).

Shrake, E. "Big D Reduced to Atoms." Sports Illustrated. 3 September 1973.

Sleeper, David. "AYA Convocation Ponders Athletics." Yale Alumni Magazine, December, 1974.

Smith, Steve. "Bonner of Union: A Conflict over Ice Hockey, Admissions, and Education." Chronicle of Higher Education, 9 May, 1977.

Smith, Steve. "Controversial Hockey Coach Quits at Union College, Cites 'Harassment' of Players." Chronicle of Higher Education, 9 January, 1978.

Stuttaford, G. "The Showcase Nazi Olympics." San Francisco Chronicle/ Examiner, 23 August, 1971.

Taylor, Sec. "Presidential Address of the Association of Football Writers of America." North Central Association Quarterly, 27 (October 1952).

"Touchdowns At Any Price." Christian Century, 31 January, 1951.

"Track: Aiming at Excellence." Bostonia, Spring 1977.

Van Dyne, Larry. "Foreign Athletes Recruited by Colleges are Dominating Many U.S. Sports Events." Chronicle of Higher Education, 29 March, 1976.

Williams, Roger M. "Away With Big-Time Athletics." Saturday Review, 6 March, 1976.

FOR FURTHER READING

Few articles or books on athletics deal primarily with small colleges. Relevant news items and short articles appear occasionally in The Chronicle of Higher Education, The NAIA News, The NCAA News, Sports Illustrated, and the alumni magazines of colleges. The books discussed and listed below are among the best that deal with the broader world of sport rather than focusing on small colleges.

At several points Michener's Sports in America contains lists of books with accompanying comment, which together comprise a good annotated bibliography. On pages 13-15 he discusses books that are moderately critical of intercollegiate and professional athletics. The reader, he declares, "cannot ignore the basic questions they raise." To those on his list should be added the one by Jack Scott (listed above) and those by Lipsyte and Shecter (below). Neither he nor I include the less objective exposés by Flood, Oliver, Parish, and Sample.

On pages 168-69 and 324-29 Michener analyzes his selection of the best books on baseball, football, basketball, tennis, and golf. To these he adds (pp. 254-5) two books about Woody Hayes and football. Novels, drama, and poetry are perceptively surveyed on pages 225-30. Finally, pages 242-46 are devoted to highlights from a volume that depicts the geographical distribution of sports in the United States.

In The Joy of Sports, pages 343-51, Novak presents a well-chosen list of about 170 books and 40 articles. Although no annotation is provided, he divides the books into two categories: those "that try to evoke experience" and "those that seemed to go beyond that . . . to add elements of theory."

The recommendations of Michener and Novak are not included in the list below, except for a few that are also mentioned in the following discussion, all of which are listed below.

A few significant contributions have emerged from the human potential movement (some of them apparently inspired by the Esalen Sports Center) in addition to that of Leonard (included above). Probably the best known are those by Murphy and Gallwey, the latter reflecting an interest in Zen, as do those of Rohe and the German philosopher Herrigel.

Potboilers keep appearing by star athletes and coaches, often written in collaboration with journalists. These are generally interesting because of the lively people and events with which they deal. Most of them are pretty much alike, however, and rather superficial. Definitely above the average is Instant Replay by Jerry Kramer, about his experiences with the Green Bay Packers under Lombardi. Another good one is Go Up For Glory by Bill Russell, containing insights on life in pro basketball and the problems black players faced at that time. The Killer Instinct by Bob Cousy reveals the feelings of a college coach who felt the pressure to break recruiting rules to maintain a winning tradition. He then shares his frustrating experiences as coach of a consistently losing professional team.

Three biographies of coaches are genuinely entertaining. Brondfield obviously admires Woody Hayes, yet he pulls no punches in describing Woody's antics and foibles. The account left me with the feeling that I could really appreciate and understand Hayes. Joe Falls' story of Bo Schembechler and his career to date, and Bear, by Bryant and Underwood, are equally absorbing.

Because they are written by star athletes of exceptional intelligence and academic training, the books by Bannister and Bradley are well worth reading. So also is Angell's Five Seasons. Gerber's The American Woman in Sport and Edwards' The Revolt of the Black Athlete survey these areas quite adequately. Certain essays in the collections by Flaherty and Riesman contain penetrating observations on sport, as do two of Santayana's essays in the Ballowe volume.

During the past decade scholars in the various academic disciplines have paid increasing attention to the phenomenon of sport. Edwards' Sociology of Sport and the anthologies by Sage (listed under Cozens) and by Ball and Loy are included in the above bibliography. To these should be added the collections by Talamini and Page, and by Loy and Kenyon (below). Together, these anthologies contain an abundance of articles and excerpts from books, which comprise an ample bibliography on the sociology of sport.

The most rewarding books in the philosophy of sport include the pioneering work of the renowned philosopher Paul Weiss, plus excellent studies by VanderZwaag and Zeigler and the collection of original essays compiled by Osterhoudt. Gerber's anthology, Sport and the Body, covers a wide range of philosophical concerns and contains comprehensive bibliographies at the end of each section. The Journal of the Philosophy of Sport will keep one au courant in this area.

In psychology, Beisser's volume deals largely with case histories of athletes who sought personal counseling. The Psychology of Coaching by Tutko and Richards contains an intriguing section contrasting different personality types among coaches. Ogilvie and Tutko have produced not only the volume listed below but also numerous articles in journals.

The best way to keep abreast of historical studies is by noting the extensive reviews in The Journal of Sport History. In most academic disciplines the professional journals now include more articles on sport than was formerly the case.

Publication details regarding the books mentioned in the preceding paragraphs, if not included in the above listing, are as follows:

Angell, Roger. *Five Seasons*. New York: Simon and Schuster. 1977.

Ballowe, F., ed. *George Santayana's America*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1967.

Bannister, Roger. *The Four Minute Mile*. New York: Dodd-Mead, 1955.

Beisser, Arnold R. *The Madness in Sport*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967.

Bradley, Bill. *Life on the Run*. New York: Quadrangle Books, 1976.

Brondfield, Jerry. *Woody Hayes and the 100-Yard War*. New York: Random House, 1975.

Bryant, Paul W. and Underwood, John. *Bear: The Hard Life and Good Times of Alabama's Coach Bryant*. New York: Bantam, 1974.

Cousy, Bob. *The Killer Instinct*. New York: Random House, 1975.

Edwards, Harry. *The Revolt of the Black Athlete*. New York: The Free Press, 1969.

Falls, Joe. *Bo Schembechler: Man in Motion*. Ann Arbor: School-Tech Press, 1973.

Flaherty, Joe. *Chez Joey*. New York: Coward, McCann and Geoghegan, 1974.

Gallwey, Timothy. *The Inner Game of Tennis*. New York: Random House, 1974.

Gerber, Ellen, et.al. *The American Woman in Sport*. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1974.

Gerber, Ellen, editor. *Sport and the Body*. Philadelphia: Lea and Febiger, 1972.

Herrigel, Eugen. *Zen in the Art of Archery*. New York: Pantheon, 1953.

Kramer, Jerry. *Instant Replay*. New York: New American Library, 1969.

Lipsyte, Robert. *Sportsworld*. New York: Quadrangle Books, 1975.

Loy, John W., Jr. and Kenyon, Gerald, S., editors. *Sport, Culture, and Society: A Reader on the Sociology of Sport*. New York: Macmillan, 1969.

Murphy, Michael. *Golf in the Kingdom*. New York: Viking Press, 1972.

Ogilvie, Bruce, and Tutko, Thomas. Problem Athletes and How to Handle Them. Pelham Books: London, 1966.

Osterhoudt, Robert, editor. The Philosophy of Sport. Springfield, Illinois: C.C. Thomas, 1973.

Riesman, David. Individualism Reconsidered. New York: The Free Press, 1954.

Rohe, Fred. The Zen of Running. New York: Random House, 1975.

Russell, Bill. Go Up for Glory. New York: Coward McCann, 1966.

Shecter, Leonard. The Jocks. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1969.

Talamini, John T. and Page, Charles H., editors. Sport and Society: An Anthology. Boston: Little, Brown, 1973.

Tutko, Thomas and Richards, Jack. The Psychology of Coaching. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

Weiss, Paul. Sport: A Philosophic Inquiry. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1969.

Zeigler, Earle F. Problems in the History and Philosophy of Physical Education and Sport. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1968.

VanderZwaag, Harold J. Toward a Philosophy of Sport. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1972.

The University of Michigan, as an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action employer, complies with applicable federal and state laws prohibiting discrimination, including Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. It is the policy of The University of Michigan that no person, on the basis of race, sex, color, religion, national origin or ancestry, age, marital status, handicap, or Vietnam-Era Veteran status, shall be discriminated against in employment, educational programs and activities, or admissions. Inquiries or complaints may be addressed to the University's Director of Affirmative Action, Title IX and Section 504 Compliance, 5072 Administration Building, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109. (313) 763-0235.